

Napcod – working towards communities taking the lead

A case study from Namibia

M Seely¹, K Schachtschneider², S Bethune³ and J Zeidler⁴

¹Desert Research Foundation of Namibia

P O Box 20232, Windhoek, Namibia

²Water Environment Division

Department of Water Affairs

Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development

Private Bag: 13193, Windhoek, Namibia

³Department of Environmental Affairs

Ministry of Environment and Tourism

Private Bag:, Windhoek, Namibia

⁴Desert Research Foundation of Namibia (until 2001)

P O Box 20232, Windhoek, Namibia

A. INTRODUCTION

Project history

Namibia's National Programme to Combat Desertification (Napcod) was launched in 1994 (Wolters 1994). This event followed a long developmental history. A crucial element leading to the possibility of forming Napcod was the independence of Namibia realised only in 1990. Prior to independence, the imposed system of separate development as the key to the apartheid policy created the template for land degradation in both commercial (mainly white owned) and communal (mainly disenfranchised black farmers) farming areas. Northern communal areas of Namibia, supporting over 60% of the population, have the highest rainfall but limited development as people depend primarily on subsistence agriculture based on millet and livestock. Western and southern communal areas have low rainfall preventing cultivation of rain-fed crops, comparatively low population and limited development. Central commercial farming areas with medium to low rainfall occupy 43% of farmlands while supporting approximately 5000 individual livestock farms (UNDP 1998).

The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) (UNCCD 1996, UNCOD 1997) took place two year's after Namibia's independence which provided just enough time for the preparation of Namibia's Green Plan which was presented in Rio de Janeiro (Brown 1992). The chapter on desertification, highlighting the relationship of sustainable livelihoods and the environment, set the scene for development of Napcod. As Namibian representatives participated in the negotiations and then the conferences of parties, there was a continuous interaction between the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and the evolution of Napcod.

Napcod grew out of the Green Plan and Namibia's own needs while being nurtured by the UNCCD.

The planning of Napcod during 1994 highlighted wide participation by all identified stakeholders during a workshop, ranging from government, NGO, private organisations, farmers unions and community representatives. The result of this planning process was a dynamic programme, rather than a static plan, that is now in its third phase. Throughout the process, support has been provided primarily by the German Government through the GTZ.

A key element of Napcod was the strategic partnerships that were formed early in the process. The Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) took the lead with strong interaction and support from the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development (MAWRD). An NGO, the Desert Research Foundation of Namibia (DRFN), implemented a majority of the rural community and some of the national level components. In Phase III of Napcod, the DRFN has joined with the Namibian Economic Policy Research Unit in a consortium to implement key objectives (NAPCOD 2000).

From the beginning, Napcod was guided by a Steering Committee with wide representation from government and civil society. Early in the process the Steering Committee took the principle decision that Napcod would assume an 'umbrella' function welcoming interaction with or providing support to a variety of other projects and programmes. This approach has had great influence on Napcod's implementation, from its wide representation and many cooperating partners to a lack of clear definition of who and what is the 'essential' Napcod.

Namibian environmental and socioeconomic overview

Namibia is the most arid country south of the Sahel, covering an area of slightly more than 800,000km² (Brown 1992). Aridity decreases from the west coast with less than 20 mm rainfall to the north-east where in the semi-arid climate over 500 mm of rain occurs per annum (Dealie *et al.* 1993). This spatial variation in climate means that livelihoods of people vary greatly throughout Namibia's landscape. The climate of Namibia also experiences great temporal variability with annual rainfall totals ranging from less than one quarter of the long term mean to more than twice this value (Dealie *et al.* 1993). Low rainfall in Namibia is accompanied by high potential evaporation such that overall it is more than five times the annual rainfall (Heyns *et al.* 1998). It is estimated that of the total rainfall in an area, 83% evaporates almost immediately, 3% is available for runoff and groundwater recharge while the remaining 14% is taken up by the soil and used for plant growth returning to the atmosphere by evapotranspiration. These basic characteristics of the Namibian climate have wide ranging implications for natural resource availability and resulting land use and management.

The natural resource availability is in direct relation with settlement patterns of the rural population. 70% of the population of 1.6 million is involved in subsistence agriculture. Over 60% of Namibians live in the northern regions where rain-fed agriculture is possible in some years but which comprise only 18% of Namibia's land surface. In contrast, just 7% live south of the capital Windhoek on 32% of the land that receives less than 250 mm mean rainfall. Livestock grazing is the only potential land use in these areas with cattle predominating in the relatively higher rainfall and goats in more arid areas. Rainfall varying geographically and temporally forces farmers to be flexible in their land management systems. Flexible practices include movement of livestock to emergency grazing areas and de/restocking from one drought year to another good rainy season. Such practices should be supported nationally by appropriate market opportunities and supportive institutions. Many Namibians only have limited opportunities to successfully practice flexible land management, due to financial and past political constraints. They often resort to income diversification through measures such as migrant labour, where family members move to towns in order to make an income, tourism especially in the more arid parts of Namibia and old age pensions, which are often the only cash income entire families depend on.

The current pattern of land use and natural resource management only partially reflects the prevailing aridity and climatic variability. It also reflects past and present political, economic and social influences (Summer Desertification Programme, 1994, '95, '96, '99, '2000). Existing land degradation and loss of productivity mirror the integrated effects of landscape types, land use and land management patterns (Kakujaha 1999). The manifestations of land degradation include deforestation (in the northern areas), deterioration of rangelands (throughout), widespread soil erosion, bush encroachment (in the central areas) and localised soil salinisation (Quan et.al 1994; Wolters 1994).

In addition the Namibian population is doubling every 20 years, putting an ever greater pressure onto natural resources. Namibia's population is very diverse with over eleven distinct languages or language groups existing in the country.

Overview of legislative framework

As part of the second Napcod phase an analysis of all relevant policies was undertaken. A number of documents formulated in the eleven years since independence of Namibia directly or indirectly support integrated land and water management and sustainable development. These include, *inter alia*, the Swapo Manifesto (SWAPO 2000), the draft Communal Land Reform Bill (2000), the Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform Act (1995), the Water Policy (2000) and draft Water Act (2001), the National Agricultural Policy (1995) and the Community Based Natural Resource Management policy and regulations (MET 1997).

Only some of this policy and legislative framework takes into consideration the aridity and variable climate of Namibia, often assuming instead that the productivity of the land is a constant. An example is the high priority placed on irrigated agriculture for job creation and growth, wherein the natural variability of Namibia's arid climate can be at least partially circumvented (Swapo's plan of action, 1999 [SWAPO 2000]). Three objectives of the Swapo policy include: to bring small-holder farmers into the mainstream of the Namibian economy; to redress past imbalances in the distribution of land as a resource; and to create employment through full-time farming. In view of the need for flexibility and quick response time to Namibia's arid and variable climate, at least two of these three objectives run contrary to current developments taking place in the country. For example, land is not a resource, it is the resources on the land that are important, a concept often misunderstood during land redistribution rhetoric and programmes. Moreover, full-time farming is neither a desired objective for most Namibians nor is it a reality for most farmers as absentee farming and urban migration is steadily increasing. While it is extremely important to redress past imbalances in distribution of land as a resource, it must be remembered that the condition of a variety of renewable and non-renewable natural resources is what gives land its value for people and land itself is not a resource. As in Zimbabwe, much of the productive commercial farming is still in the hands of predominantly white individual farmers. Resettlement of formerly disadvantaged communal farmers often involves a conversion from a commercial to a communal farming system providing resettled farmers with lower incomes than anticipated.

The Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform Act (Act 6 of 1995) considers the varying rainfall and quality of farmlands throughout Namibia. Indeed, the pattern of acquisition of commercial farmland by the government in Namibia tends to confirm this recognition. The act itself, appropriately, does not take the next step of addressing farm management emphasising aridity and climate variability nor does it prevent absentee farm management, a common response to constraints in Namibia contributing to land degradation. Absentee farming is a growing phenomenon as farmers are unable to make a living solely from farming. As a consequence, the male head of household often takes on a salaried job in a distant urban area while maintaining decision making powers over the distant farm often leading to poor overall management of variable resources.

Environmentally sustainable land use is incorporated into the National Land Policy (1998) in both urban and rural contexts. However, some of the sections, e.g. that on land enclosure, ignore environmental considerations and focus on spatial planning and consultation with users. This document highlights the attention paid to sustainable development in policy development, however, to date these concerns are not backed up by regulations, training, capacity building or all the other aspects of integrated land and water management essential for sustainable development.

Similarly, the draft National Resettlement Policy (2000) addresses resettlement that is 'institutionally, socially, economically and environmentally sustainable and which will enable settlers to become self supporting'. In some instances inappropriate land use has been promoted during its application. For resettlement and redistribution to be successful, political and social goals must be amalgamated with environmental realities of our arid and variable climate. This amalgamation is often hard to implement, however, as decision makers do not have sufficient information on the consequences of nor give adequate recognition to the variability of an arid environment in a country such as Namibia.

The National Agricultural Policy (1995) goes a long way toward supporting sustainable development in Namibia. Should the various components of this policy be implemented, agricultural development would be enhanced. Similarly, the National Drought Policy & Strategy (1997) specifically addresses the arid and variable climate of Namibia. It points out that dry times are natural occurrences for which planning and preparation are essential. This includes the flexibility, adaptability and rapid response essential for good land management. 'Disaster droughts', for which planning, preparation and ongoing integrated management are insufficient and which require external intervention, is an infrequent occurrence in Namibia (National Drought Policy & Strategy 1997).

The draft Water Bill (2000) provides many tools in support of sustainable development of Namibia. It reinforces the Constitution of Namibia wherein it states that all water belongs to the state. Riparian rights (exclusive rights for people living along a watercourse) and the allocation of water rights with land rights are both excluded from the draft Bill. These elements could have negative implications for integrated land and water management if inappropriately applied. Decentralisation (Decentralisation Enabling Bill 2000) is promoted by the draft Water Bill through the appointment and training of Water Point Committees (WPC's) within communities, who have the responsibility to manage the communities' water resources. The concept of Basin Management Committees as primary planning and integrated management units is being explored.

In summary, concepts of environmentally sustainable development, explicitly or implicitly including land and water management, are found in many components of Namibia's legislative framework. Nevertheless, application of this framework to current practices will not be sufficient to ensure the desired outcome. Appropriate concepts and approaches are available but capacity, interest and willingness to change by farmers and land use planners are limited. As long as long-term sustainable development, including by definition economic, social and environmental aspects, is seen in opposition to the immediate needs and development of the formally disadvantaged population, the current legislative framework will not address the outcomes all Namibians seek.

The Project Napcod

Napcod is a partnership programme between the government, public private service organisations (SOs), the non-governmental organisation sector (NGO), as well as the community-based organisations (CBOs) and individuals. The implementing government ministries are the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) and the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development (MAWRD) (Napcod 1997). In the north, two regional networks, supported by Napcod and others, bring together all regional environmental organisations, political and traditional leaders and decision makers around one table. Most of the key players are part of a national Napcod Counterpart Network, which meets once a month and maintains a monthly e-mail newsletter.

Napcod is implemented in three distinct phases. Napcod Phase I, implemented in 1994, constituted a one-year planning and awareness raising phase. Phase II, extending from 1995 – 1999, focused on eight objectives derived during Phase I encompassing awareness generation and the initiation of full community participation. Phase III, currently in progress, is addressing national and local level monitoring and enhancement of capacities of service and community-based organisations to combat desertification.

The overall goal of Napcod is *'to combat the processes of desertification by promoting the sustainable and equitable use of natural resources suited to Namibia's variable environment for the benefit of all Namibians both present and future.'*

The Project: Napcod Phase I

Napcod I was a planning phase in which questions were posed first, regarding desertification in Namibia, the relevant stakeholders and the needs to be addressed, before designing an appropriate programme approach.

Economic research undertaken during this phase indicated that economic losses from desertification amounted to US\$40 million per annum, a statistic that boosted the interest of decision makers on all levels (Quan et.al. 1994).

Thirteen rural communities throughout Namibia's vast expanse, representing varying biophysical areas and socio-economic systems, were fully incorporated into the programme. Starting off using participatory appraisal methods, input from the rural farmers informed the process of their experiences of loss of productivity and then brought this experience to the mid-year National Workshop (Wolters 1994). A drama group helped them describe the workshop process and results to their surrounding communities. At the same time, a slightly different strategy was evolved to include government, non-government and civil society from the urban areas. All representative stakeholders at the national workshop in

1994 (225 participants) were directly involved in the definition of an overall goal and the designing of a draft policy and framework for a national programme through identification of eight key objectives with different local and national entry points for programme interventions (Wolters 1994).

The Project: Napcod Phase II

Napcod Phase II was directed by eight objectives, identified during the National workshop in 1994.

Objective 1 was *'key players are identified and their capacity is established/improved.'* By involving a wide range of key players, Napcod enjoys the support of ministries and NGO's in sensitising their own staff as well as in integrating desertification concerns into ongoing national, regional and local programmes and activities. Particularly important in Namibia's vast, sparsely populated rural areas are the ties, still being strengthened, with elected regional councils and their administrative staff as well as with regional staff of central ministries. Traditional leaders participated in the 1994 workshop and remain committed partners (Wolters 1994).

The media represent another key player in Napcod who have contributed nationwide to increased awareness of Namibia's arid and variable climate.

The Southern African Development Community – Environment and Land Management Sector is a key contact in Napcod. They have designated the Gobabeb Training and Research Centre in Namibia as the SADC-ELMS focal point for training, research and networking in support of the CCD.

Objective 2 of Napcod II was *'mechanisms for information collection, analysis and communication are established, strengthened and functioning.'* Facilitation of information flow back and forth among rural natural resource users and national decision makers has been a major focus of Napcod. In support of Napcod, the DRFN frequently dedicates issues of its 'Environmental Update' to desertification matters. Updates are circulated to parliamentarians on a twice monthly basis while they are in session. International communication, through publications and through participation in workshops and conferences, is wide spread.

Objective 3 of Napcod II was *'integrated planning strategies and approaches at all levels developed and introduced on the basis of clearly defined policies.'* This objective served to inform all activities of Napcod, from national to local level and included cooperative planning amongst participating ministries, NGO's and CBOs throughout the programme. One highlight was the evolution of the Forum for Integrated Resource Management, known as Firm. Initiated on a pilot basis, four

funded projects attempted to synergise their inputs and support to and interactions with one already well developed, organised and active CBO, the Grootberg Farmers Association. These projects included: Napcod, the Sustainable Animal and Range Development Programme (Sardep), the Communal Area Water Supply (Caws) project and the wildlife-oriented community-based natural resource management programme known as the Living in a Finite Environment (Life) programme. Firm addressed improved goat production, integrating wildlife and tourism into the livelihoods of the community, improved management of water supply and broadly enhanced information exchange and networking. The success of this integrated planning and approach is substantiated by the replacement of one project by a government department as participants, demand from the CBO for further support from government and private Service Organisations – strongly promoted by the projects, and requests for this type of intervention to be repeated elsewhere in Namibia.

Objective 4 of Napcod II was '*appropriate inter-disciplinary research programme elaborated and implemented.*' Although identified by the 1994 national workshop as an objective, limited funds were allocated to this objective. This was partially based on the funders' view of basic research and its lack of application.

However, research carried out by local and international researchers was encouraged, coordinated and integrated into Napcod wherever possible (Jacobson 1997). As part of this initiative a pilot project was conducted, integrating formal and traditional knowledge. The purpose of the pilot study was to determine reliable indicators of habitat/ range condition in a scientific manner, to compare the results and methods with locally used ones, and to develop needs- based natural resource monitoring systems with local farmers. The development of practical systems to monitor the natural resource base are seen as essential to equip farmers with reliable management tools for use on farm. A decision making support system would allow the farmer to make informed decisions, for example concerning grazing areas and water resources. Whereas it is essential to develop reliable monitoring tools for formal science, it is equally important to develop systems that can easily be adopted and applied by farmers with limited education. The scientific approach used bio- physical and biodiversity indicators to determine habitat / range condition.

The pilot study, supported by the GTZ and the Tropenökologisches Begleitprogramm (TÖB), was conducted at commercial, communal and so-called Odendaal farms – farms that were under commercial land tenure for 20 years before being incorporated into communal areas (Zeidler *et al.*, 1999). The study area was located in northwestern Namibia, in southern Kunene region, formerly known as Damaraland. The three main study sites are situated in an area of relatively similar range of 150 – 250mm mean annual rainfall and on similar parent material, predominantly gneiss. Vegetation types are also comparable.

Livestock farming is the main land use, but small rainfed and/ or irrigated vegetables gardens are maintained in exceptionally good rainfall years.

The main findings from the pilot study (Hamukwaya, 1998; Parenzee, 2000; Zeidler *et al.*, 1999, Zeidler, 2000a, b):

- Local farmers see a need for monitoring their natural resources. They are interested in developing such systems, often have a profound knowledge of the ecology and processes on their farms and they are keen to develop management systems that allow them to use resources in an adaptive manner.
- Traditionally farmers use vegetation based assessments to determine range condition. These methods are usually promoted by Agricultural Extension (AE). However, the pilot study showed that the use of a broader set of indicators in the form of an index (here Index of Biological Integrity, IBI), including measurements of soil resilience, vegetation productivity and invertebrate biodiversity, were superior in discriminating areas that were degraded versus areas that were less constrained. In variable environments, which are predominant in Namibia, vegetation is often inconspicuous in years of little rain, and thus vegetation indicators are not useful in determining whether or not an area is degraded. A place that looks totally overgrazed today might flourish with palatable forage after adequate rains.
- Areas under high land use intensity were more constrained than areas under light land use. This was particularly true on communally managed farms.
- Land use intensity was not directly related to stocking numbers *per se*. The opportunity to move animals to 'emergency' grazing areas, especially during periods of prolonged drought, was crucial for good management. Communal farmers often have less access to such 'emergency' areas.
- It is important to reveal the constraints to farming in the various areas. Communal management of natural resources is difficult, as ownership and use of natural resources and distribution of profits are not always equal.
- Besides monitoring of habitat/ range condition, other aspects of natural resources, such as socio- economic aspects, should be monitored. Farmers in the Grootberg area in north- western Namibia, who are situated in a conservancy area in which they have rights to use wildlife and generate wildlife related incomes, are interested in wildlife, habitat and impact monitoring. Impact monitoring relates in this case to establishing whether conservancy related opportunities do in fact help improve livelihood security and household incomes in the community sustainably.
- Monitoring systems must be adapted to needs. Scientifically sound indicators have to be linked to easily monitored surrogates, and methods must be

designed for easy implemented and use by farmers, some of whom are illiterate.

- It is important to also provide guidance in solution finding and management opportunities. Often these are related to policy issues in Namibia.

Participatory research with local communities is ongoing and the pilot project approach is being refined and retested in Napcod III. Finding indicators that are both reliable and easy to understand for local farmers remains a very big challenge.

Objective 5 of Napcod II was '*appropriate training and education provided according to needs at all levels.*' Although always a guiding principle to Napcod, this objective was not directly funded by the programme. Various associated programmes were undertaken.

These included the cross-curricular environmental education project known as Enviroteach , implemented by DRFN on behalf of the Ministry of Basic Education and Culture funded by Sida, that addressed the lack of environmental education materials and training appropriate for Namibia. The Summer Desertification Project (SDP), implemented by DRFN with 15 University and Polytechnic students and funding from Sida, constitutes a hands-on field training in environmental problem solving for development. Eight regional books addressing Water and Grazing Management for use by government extension staff (implemented by DRFN on behalf of the Directorate of Rural Water Supply funded by Sida) have been written. In addition, Napcod facilitated a variety of training activities for farmers in Napcod pilot areas ranging from organisational development of community organisations to improved stock management.

Appropriate stock management practices for Namibia's variable environment have been tested, implemented and disseminated to farmers throughout Namibia. Some of the key elements include:

- Increase of fodder, e.g. through supplements or enhancing local fodder production,
- Reduced fodder in- take during droughts through management actions e.g. shifts in water regimes, improved health and husbandry of well adapted breeds,
- Development of livestock movement strategies, including rotational grazing practices,
- Marketing of animals in an adaptive fashion, including interventions on the micro- and macro- economic levels to offer conducive opportunities and incentives to farmers,
- Diversifying and improving agricultural production on farm, especially in the communal farming areas,

- Complementing purely agricultural dependent livelihoods with off- farm economic opportunities e.g. through Small- and Micro- Enterprise development.

Training courses in livestock and range management have been conducted and are still being undertaken at all pilot sites, as a combined effort by two programmes, the Sustainable Animal and Range Development Project (Sardep) and Napcod. The experience exchange and sharing of lessons learned among the farmers are being fostered through farmer visits.

Objective 6 of Napcod II was '*natural resource users and managers empowered to plan and implement sustainable management practices in an integrated and decentralised manner.*' This objective was at the heart of Napcod II and all other objectives contributed to this one in various ways.

Northern Namibia: Over 50% of Namibia's population live in four densely populated regions of Ohangwena, Omusati, Oshana and Oshikoto. Urbanisation and rural development are concentrated on the central part of the Cuvelai basin with its ephemeral wetlands known as oshanas (Marsh and Seely 1992). Pearl millet is the major rain-fed crop and livestock forms an important part of the agricultural system. As much of the underlying groundwater is saline, people in this area rely on water transported by open canals and pipes from the shared (with Angola) Kunene River. Although people living in the three pilot sites have sufficient natural resources to support their current life styles, the rapidly growing population (>3% per annum) is accelerating loss of productivity. Deforestation and use of wood, particularly for construction and fencing but also for fuel, and management of livestock are the key questions.

Both of these issues have their basis in tradition and social structures. The '40' region lies on Kalahari sands with rainfall ranging from 350-500 mm per annum. Use of wood, for construction of homestead palisades and for fencing agricultural land, is intense and deforestation has been well documented (Erkkila & Siiskonen 1992). Fencing croplands provides the most value for the wood used (Marsh 1994). Economic analyses suggest that the value of wood used from the common resource pool is far higher than the cost would be if modern wire fences were used. However, tradition dictates that wood is used and even wealthy businessmen have their modern house and a traditional palisade homestead to maintain their heritage. Consequences of this tradition include forced transition to use of alternative resources for fencing, e.g. palm fronds, and alternative fuel such as cattle dung. Other consequences are a switch to alternative building materials, e.g. cement and bricks, and modern wire fences.

Napcod, and its associated project Rap (Regional Awareness Project implemented by DRFN with German funding), has promoted awareness about these facets of deforestation. Living fences are one alternative Rap has incorporated into a brochure and awareness activities. This was done in

conjunction with the Northern Namibia Forestry Committee and its members from government and the NGO sector.

A promotion of fuel efficient stoves has been very effective, undertaken in conjunction with German-funded Regional Biomass Energy Conservation, ProBEC implemented in Namibia by DRFN (Mathews 2001). The Steering Committee of this project includes government and the private sector and is chaired by the Ministry of Mines and Energy. This project included training in stove making, stove promotion and marketing, participatory research and demonstration of the value of these stoves and general business practice. The savings in time and energy for women and the conservation of natural woody vegetation are key links in this project. Napcod III has taken on this programme in partnership with an engineering firm, NGO's and government.

Livestock have always been a part of peoples' livelihoods in north-central Namibia. Goats and chickens are used by the household or sold for ready cash and are often managed by women. Cattle, on the other hand, have cultural value and are primarily managed by men. As an adaptation to variable climate and patchy rainfall, herds are often split-up and parts of one person's herd will be managed with parts of other people's herds. Sale of livestock on the formal market has always been constrained by veterinary restrictions although sale on the 'bush butchery' gains more money per head than in the formal market. Livestock numbers have paralleled the increase of human population since the early 1900s. A key element of the socio-economic situation is high mobility of people living in this region. For the latter half of the 1900s, a system of migratory male labour was firmly entrenched while women were restricted to the northern regions. Management practices established during that period are reinforced by the current high degree of 'absentee' farming with decision makers and owners of livestock, mainly males, maintaining control over assets from a distance while they earn a living in town (Seely 1999).

Livestock management has been the focus of Sardep, a sister project to Napcod, also funded through GTZ. Most Napcod activities related to livestock build on Sardep activities. Napcod has undertaken participatory research on the relationship of livestock and land productivity, e.g. their negative impact on establishment of woody vegetation, and on the ancillary social and biophysical impacts of illegal fencing of communal land by large livestock owners. This information is available to local communities through Napcod's local facilitators as well as the established networks in northern Namibia and nationally (Mururoa pers comm.).

Western Namibia: Approximately 20% of Namibia's population is dependent on twelve westward-flowing ephemeral rivers originating in the central highlands and flowing through the Namib Desert into the southern Atlantic (Jacobson *et al.* 1995). Inland from the desert, at somewhat below 100 mm mean rainfall, farming begins. Small and large livestock are the focus while wildlife and tourism

present major activities for alternative or supplementary incomes. Pilot areas of Napcod all fall within the western Kunene Region. Prior to the 1900s, this region was used on a seasonal basis by people and livestock rather than being permanently settled. Permanent settlement was established with implementation of the separate development policy in mid-century and people have coped with various policy changes since then. Some land was demarcated as commercial farms, fenced and water developed, and then returned to communal management (Kambatuku 1996, Kamwi 1997). In these instances several families tended to remove all internal farm fencing and manage one farm as a single communal unit. Other land was always managed communally. Water represents the focus of village development, whether it be along the ephemeral rivers or at boreholes. This has been reinforced by establishment of Water Point Committees as a new decentralised management structure introduced by government since independence.

Decision making over livestock management, as in the north, falls to males. Since absenteeism is even more developed in the west, management often falls to women and children or hired herders. In this area, absentee farmers usually hire herders from other, higher rainfall areas of Namibia. On one hand this is to prevent theft of livestock as animals cannot be disposed of rapidly (Murorua pers. comm.) but also means that herders are not experienced in use and management of livestock in low rainfall rangelands. In times of serious drought it is usually males who make arrangements for emergency grazing or long-distance movements to distant areas. As southern Kunene falls outside of the veterinary regulated area, livestock sales should be facilitated. However, poor veld condition, contributing to low prices, and distance from markets inhibits sales. Increasing population in these western areas is increasing pressure on all natural resources and affecting their overall income generating potential.

Wildlife and spectacular scenery provide the opportunity for development of alternative income generating activities in the western catchments (SDP 1996). Several programmes, including Napcod, support and advise communities in the west on community-based tourism options and related sustainable resource management. Community-based natural resource management is most highly developed in this area and a number of conservancies have been registered by government on behalf of community organisations.

Objective 7 of Napcod II was *'identification and implementation of incentives to change human activities and support sustainable natural resources management.'* Two major activities of Napcod were implemented under this objective. A study entitled 'policy factors and desertification – analysis and proposals' (Dewdney 1996) was initiated by the Steering Committee. The aim of the study was to inform decision makers of the impact of policy instruments on desertification and make recommendations for reform. Key target audiences include politicians and senior/ mid-level public servants.

Napcod served as the secretariat for the development of Namibia's Drought Policy and Strategy. Many aspects from the policy analysis and from implementation of Napcod were incorporated into the drought policy process and final document (Namibia Drought Policy and Strategy 1997). These national level actions, incorporating Napcod's field experience, are thought to be amongst the most important of the Napcod programme.

Objective 8 of Napcod II was '*organisational management structure established and functional.*' This objective was overseen by the 11 institutions of the Steering Committee and emphasised integrated approaches and participation.

Throughout Napcod II a research approach was undertaken ensuring that critical assessments of bio-physical and socio-economic components of the environment were undertaken and that the programme itself was monitored, evaluated and adjusted continually. The findings and adjustments of Napcod II led to the formulation of the Napcod III initiatives.

The Project: Napcod Phase III

The NGO consortium of the Desert Research Foundation of Namibia (DRFN) and Namibia's Economic Research Policy Unit (NEPRU) are implementing three main components of the national programme (1999-2003), including the development of tracking and monitoring systems of desertification in Namibia, and capacity strengthening of CBOs and SO's to combat desertification and manage natural resources sustainably.

The consortium team of Napcod III is mainly working in three pilot areas in northern, western, and southern Namibia with planned input in the east. The pilot areas are situated in communal farming areas in six of thirteen regions in Namibia namely Erongo, Hardap, Karas, Kunene, Omusati and Oshana but individual interventions also take place in other regions. Napcod III is mainly operating at pilot sites that have been involved in the Sustainable Animal Range Development Programme (Sardep) of the MAWRD since the early 1990s. Sardep seeks to bridge the gap between community-based organisations and service organisations in support of sustainable agriculture. Napcod continues to support this objective.

During Napcod phase III the initial monitoring system is being furthered and improved. A livelihoods approach addressing social, human, financial, physical and natural capitals is being implemented. For ease of discussion, the main areas of investigation and action are described below. In practice these are undertaken in an integrated manner. Namibia's Monitoring and Information System (Namis) is being tested, applied and adapted to different ecosystems in the main pilot regions. This approach involves working with local farmers and other community members to establish an information baseline and identify indicators for further research and monitoring.

Habitat/ range condition: This is a continuation of Napcod II. A broad ecological baseline is being established at the various study sites and the most discriminating indicators are being identified. Based on these, components that can be measured by local farmers are elaborated. Various indicators are under consideration, including animal and vegetation based surrogates. However, it needs to be acknowledged that the identification of reliable indicators and surrogates is extremely difficult.

Sustainable use of other natural resources: As the majority of Namibian households depend on the use of natural resources for their living, either for subsistence or commerce, it is important that the renewable resource base is managed in a sustainable manner (Jacobson et.al 1995). The monitoring of resources, for example water, is therefore of vital importance (Heyns et.al 1997; Pallett 1997). The usage of potable ground and harvested water is important to understand, for example consumption patterns, and ultimately to take management decisions to wisely use and protect the resource. Other crucial parameters are the consumption of wood, either for buildings, fuels or material for handicrafts. Various resources are being included in the monitoring systems now being developed at the partner communities in the Napcod III pilot regions. Water, for instance, is a major concern at the Olifantputs farm in the Kunene region, whereas deforestation is a primary concern in Uuvudhiya in Oshana region. Relevant interventions, supported by Napcod, are underway at these sites.

Socio-economic monitoring systems: In the desertification context it is important to understand how livelihoods in Namibia depend on the natural resource base and how desertification constraints them (Seely & Jacobson 1994; Stiles 1995). To identify viable alternatives to purely agricultural based livelihoods, the socio-economic situation needs to be well understood by farmers themselves to adapt their lifestyles. As these monitoring systems include personal data, it is essential that the farmers and community members identify with the need to track these. Involvement of all participants through the Namis approach helps but does not ensure this step. The socio-economic monitoring system to date includes information on household composition, assets, cash flows, rural- urban remittance dynamics, information on livestock, crop ownership and dynamics. Namis involves questioning communities about past changes and future expectations.

Development of training and management materials: Currently most of the monitoring systems are being developed in consultation with farmers and community members. However, the development of materials for training and improved management is resource intensive and multiplication of the approach is difficult. It is essential to develop appropriate materials that can be used by broader audience. It is equally important to offer management opportunities and

options that can be used in response to the monitoring of both bio-physical and socio- economic aspects of the environment.

In summary, a variety of interventions are taking place in a number of localities. These interventions follow from the initial national planning workshop of Napcod, being modified according to the interests of the communities involved. The changing policy framework in Namibia has also resulted in some shifts of direction of some interventions. Appropriateness of the interventions is judged by the communities where they are being undertaken. Participatory monitoring and evaluation of interventions is taking place by communities in collaboration with Napcod staff.

B. Scale

Napcod has links to conventions, protocols and policies at international and national scales, which have all had some impact on and provided support to Napcod . On an international scale the UNCCD is an important influencing factor since Namibia ratified in 1997. Within SADC, Napcod is linked to the SADC ELMS and the SADC Protocols, of which the Shared Rivers Protocol is one example. On a national scale the programme success is dependent on the different Policies and Acts that influence issues of ILWRM. On the other hand Napcod has had the opportunity to contribute to the review of the Drought, Water and Agriculture Policies recently, so as to harmonise and fill the gaps in respect of sustainable resource management.

Napcod, as a National Programme, operates on a national scale but is geared towards community needs. Accordingly, the operating scales of pilot sites differ according to community definitions of scale. Some case studies are treated on a catchment level, while others are defined by traditional or conservancy boundaries.

The first event enabling a programme such as Napcod was Namibia's Independence in 1990, providing the opportunity of rewriting the legislative framework, changing management approaches and getting access to donor money. The presentation of Namibia's Green Plan in Rio (1992) was an important opportunity which led to the holding of the national workshop in 1994 and Namibia's ratification to the UNCCD in 1997. The DRFN gained international credibility when it was recognised as a Centre of Excellence by SADC in 1998.

C. Power and influence

Several uncertainties exist, which may affect the success of Napcod and ultimately impact on community livelihoods. Due to the recency of different approaches and the rewriting of policies since independence it is unclear whether these uncertainties will have positive or negative effects.

In a decentralisation effort the MAWRD is passing the responsibility of water management into the hands of Water Point Committees within communities, who are responsible of managing and maintaining the resource. Similarly the MET is passing the responsibility of wildlife and other natural resources management into the hands of communities when they form so-called conservancies. The empowerment of the population to make guided decisions on their resource use is intended to instill a feeling of responsibility and promote wise resource use. Unfortunately these efforts are too recent to comment on the long term effects and successes.

The aspects of sustainable resource use have been integrated into most relevant policies and the shortcomings are still under review. The question remains if and how an ILWRM approach within policies can actually be put into practice.

The political and economic stability of Namibia can have profound influences on the tourism market. Since independence the tourism market is the fourth largest and fastest growing sector of the Namibian economy growing at 6 – 9 percent per annum (Minister of Environment and Tourism, 1998). However, these promising figures are shadowed by occurrences such as the Caprivi unrests, where the tourism market, especially the established community tourism in the area has collapsed since 2000. Increasing inflation and recession rates make alternative income generation for poor Namibians less viable.

On a more local scale resource management in communal areas is negatively affected by absentee farmers. Family heads move to towns in order to generate alternative income, while leaving the rest of the family behind without full decision making powers. In times of crisis, such as drought, the family may not be able to adapt their management strategy in time and overutilise the available resources.

Many rich and influential Namibians keep vast amounts of livestock on communal land, while they could afford buying commercial farmland. Often they illegally fence off an area of communal land for their exclusive use. Their practices marginalise the poor even further, who are really dependent on the resources for survival.

D. Uncertainties

Throughout the implementation of Napcod and other programmes, there is a high level of uncertainty. Ten years after independence, many of the promised developments, such as improved livelihoods for all in Namibia, have not materialised so uncertainty concerning future livelihood possibilities remain. Generally, people are beginning to realise the improvements will not all come from government and initiatives are being taken. Diversification e.g. development of ecotourism as an income generating activity based on natural

resources or brewing of beer as a cash income, is one component although identification of alternative income generating activities appears to be infrequent.

Natural hazards affecting livelihoods are understood at least in outline, but many occur only infrequently, e.g. flooding of ephemeral rivers or over-bank flooding of perennial rivers, and are often ignored by local residents until too late. Changes introduced through changes in policy, regulations and institutions are manifold and have become a way of life for most rural farmers. These include, *inter alia*, the decentralisation process and the introduction of an additional layer of government, the regional authorities and new institutions such as Water Point Committees. Uncertainty is reduced by imbedding these changes within the tradition system, a process that is more strongly developed in some parts of Namibia, e.g. the north, whose population all supports the ruling party, than in others, e.g. the west where government and traditional interests do not coincide.

Intended alternative income generation opportunities, such as tourism, are readily integrated by communities into their resource use practices as a supplementary income source. Only in very few cases have communities given up original practices to be replaced by such alternatives. While supplementary income opportunities provide increased livelihood security, long term environmental sustainability is often not directly visible.

Long term commitment of government and communities to ILWRM after the completion of the programme is unknown.

F. Lessons Learnt

A variety of lessons have been learned throughout the process of Napcod and other interactions with rural communities to address desertification. These range from organisational and institutional lessons to lessons about natural resource management. All have been incorporated into the rolling planning process of Napcod phases I, II and III.

Livestock and range management: In an environment as variable as Namibia's in its climatic conditions, adaptive management and tracking of stocking numbers according to resource availability are essential (Toulmin 1995).

Diversified livelihoods and incomes: The promotion of off- farm opportunities is essential to natural resource management in Namibia. Wildlife product based opportunities are for example the target of the Conservancy and Community-based Natural Resource Management programme of MET and various partners. Community-based tourism is one component of this approach. As tourism is a fairly high input industry, the sector is still primarily dominated by foreign and large investors. It is important to further develop the approach and to create more real opportunities for marginal and often fairly unskilled communities and

individual community members in this industry. This again requires an extremely resource intensive development input.

Other SME opportunities need to be facilitated. In Namibia, where infrastructure in the rural areas is often poor, population size and economic purchasing power are low and markets for most products are generally small, SME promotion is a challenge.

It is important to involve stakeholders, experienced in economic and business development, in activities that are indirectly related to combating desertification.

Building partnerships to combat desertification: It is clear that to effectively control desertification, partners from all walks of life and disciplines have to work together. Desertification cannot be seen as a bio-physical phenomenon only; it needs to be addressed in a livelihood and rural development context in order to bear lasting fruits. In Namibia, network platforms on various levels are being established to facilitate information exchange, co-ordinate interventions and form partnership projects on all levels. Firstly, it is important to identify the real needs and concerns of rural households and CBOs. These need to be communicated to the service organisations, both public and private, in order to develop needs-oriented and appropriate services.

Secondly, the co-ordination of and collaboration in service provision are essential. Partners from various departments and disciplines need to work together to deliver suitable goods.

Lessons learned in the UNCCD context: Namibia now looks back on a decade of new interventions and testing of various approaches to community-based natural resource management, rural development, SME promotion, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, all ultimately adding up to a joint effort against desertification. The major lesson learnt is that all these issues relate ultimately to livelihood security and poverty alleviation. The realisation of human aspects of the environment leads to the development and refinement of people centered approaches and methodologies. The development of well-targeted training and information materials, the creation of true opportunities at the grass-roots level, and the facilitation of communication, information exchange and collaboration and support amongst all stakeholders is essential. Furthering conducive policy environments that reach out to the people in rural areas is equally important.

The main trend had been pro-active: working with ongoing local and national plans, projects and initiatives to facilitate and implement activities conducive to better understanding of land degradation and combating desertification in Namibia, rather than spending time and resources in the detailed development of national action policy documents. This notion has been carried forward in the implementation of all of the environmental conventions ratified by Namibia. Most

of them are being implemented in close collaboration and are cross-cutting in their nature. Namibia, for example, has a "Conventions Synergy Committee", which helps create synergy between various convention related activities.

Over the past decade, Namibia has learned many lessons through the implementation of various environmental conventions and related programmes. These are brought forward through a continuous monitoring and evaluation process that direct future interventions, and which is shared throughout the SADC region.

Success: It is difficult to provide convincing quantitative data to show the successes of all interventions Napcod is involved in. Identifying indicators of success for every intervention is equally challenging. An overall indicator of success, measurable at the end of Napcod, will be the comparison of the numbers of farmers requesting drought aid in dry spells before and after independence, when the enabling environment to commence a programme such as Napcod was first realised.

Further success can be noted if the situation is compared before independence and now. The ability to conduct interdisciplinary research, involving relevant stakeholders, making community needs assessments and reviewing policies are all approaches previously unheard of. Namibia has great potential to succeed in sustainable community based land and water management with its enabling environment of so many cooperating Namibians, programmes and projects.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the various institutions and individuals involved in the Napcod programme in Namibia. A special thanks goes to the various local and international donors that support Namibia in her effort to combat desertification and promote rural development.

References

- Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform Act 1995 Act No.6, Government of the Republic, Windhoek, Namibia. pp65
- Barnard, P. 1998 (ed.). Biological diversity in Namibia – a country study, Namibian National Biodiversity Task Force, Windhoek,. pp332
- Bayer, W. & Waters-Bayer, A., 1995. Forage alternatives from range and field: pastoral forage management and improvement in the African drylands. In Scoones, I. (ed.), Living with Uncertainty. IIED, London, p. 58-78
- Blackie, R. 1999 Communities and natural resources: trends in equitable and efficient use. DEA Research Discussion paper No.29, Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Windhoek, Namibia.
- Brown, CJ (ed) 1992. Namibia's Green Plan. Ministry of Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism, Windhoek, Namibia.
- Communal Land Reform Bill (draft 2000) Ministry of Lands, Resettlement and Rehabilitation, Windhoek, Namibia.
- Darkoh M.B.K. 1993 Land degradation and soil conservation in eastern and southern Africa: a research agenda. UNEP Desertification Control Bulletin 22: 60-67.
- Darkoh, M.B.K. 1996. Towards an adaptive and community-based approach to the management of natural resources in the drylands of Sub-Saharan Africa. In: A Hjort af Ornas (ed), approaching nature from local communities, security perceived and achieved, EPOS, Research Programme on Environmental Policy and Society, Institute of Tema Research, Linkoping University, Sweden.
- Darkoh, M.B.K. 1999. Environmental security in the drylands of Africa: The role of science and technology. Desertification Control Bulletin, No 34: 6-14.
- Dealie, FF, Hamata, SA, Kambatuku, JR, Molapo, M, Parenzee, LG and Soroses, FW, 1993. Rainfall in Namibia. What is normal? Desert Research Foundation of Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia.
- Decentralisation Enabling Bill 2000. Government of the Republic of Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia

- Dewdney, R. 1996 Policy factors and desertification – analysis and proposals. DRFN, Windhoek. 95 pp.
- Erkkila, A. & Siiskonen, H. 1992 Forestry in Namibia 1850 – 1990. University of Joensuu, Joensuu, Finland. pp244
- Hamukwaya, P., 1998. Historical and present land management and land-uses at three selected farms in southern Kunene region. Research Report. TOEB project/DRFN, Windhoek, Namibia
- Heyns, P., Montgomery, S., Pallett, J. & Seely M.K. 1997 Namibia's Water: A decision makers guide. Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development/Desert Research Foundation of Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia. 173 pp.
- Jacobson, K.M. 1997 An overview of research issues relating to sustainable natural resource management in drylands. Desert Research Foundation of Namibia(DRFN), Windhoek, Namibia. 149 pp.
- Jacobson, P.J.; Jacobson K.M. & Seely M.K. 1992 Ephemeral Rivers and their catchments: Sustaining people and development in western Namibia. Desert Research Foundation of Namibia. pp160
- Kakujaha, O.; van der Linden, E.; Rudd, T.; Shiimi, T. & Simon, E. 1999. State of the Environment Report on the Socio-Economic Environment in Namibia. Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Windhoek, Namibia.
- Kamabatuku, J. 1996 Historical profiles of farms in former Damaraland - notes from the archival files. Occasional paper. Desert Research Foundation of Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia.
- Kamwi, J. 1997 Overview of environmental issues in former "Damaraland". Occasional paper. Desert Research Foundation of Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia.
- Lane, C. & Moorhead, R., 1995. New directions in rangeland and resource tenure and policy. In Scoones, I. (ed.), Living with Uncertainty, IIED, London, UK, p. 116-133
- Lorimer, M.S. 1999. Repairing the damage p 128-129 In "People and Rangelands: building the future". (Eds.) Eldridge, D. & Freudenberger, D.,

Proceedings of the VI International Rangeland Congress, Townsville, Queensland, Australia.

Marsh, A. & Seely M.K. 1992 Oshanas: sustaining people and environment and development in Central Owambo, Namibia. DRFN/SIDA, Windhoek, Namibia. pp57

MET 1997 Amendment of Regulations relating to Nature Conservation (Ordinance 4 of 1975) No.304, Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Windhoek, Namibia

Montgomery, S. (ed.) 2000. Proceedings: Community Drylands Tourism Workshop, Gobabeb Training and Research Centre, April 2000. DRFN, Windhoek. 44 pp + appendices.

Mortimer, M. 1987. Shifting sands and human sorrow: social response to drought and desertification. Desertification Control Bulletin, No. 14: 1-14.

Murorua, D. *pers.comm.* Regional Facilitator for Napcod, Desert Research Foundation of Namibia, Khorixas, Kunene region

Namibia Water Policy 2000 Policy framework for equitable, efficient, and sustainable water resources management and water services. Namibia Water Resources Management Review, Windhoek, Namibia.

Napcod 1997. Namibia's National Programme to Combat Desertification. DRFN, Windhoek, Namibia. 16 pp.

NAPCOD 2000 Phase III Proposal, DRFN/NEPRU, Windhoek, Namibia. pp80

National Agricultural Policy 1995 Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development, Windhoek, Namibia. pp40

National Drought Policy and Strategy 1997 National Drought Task Force, Windhoek, Namibia. pp14

National Land Policy 1998 Ministry of Lands, Resettlement and Rehabilitation, Windhoek, Namibia. pp18

National Resettlement Policy 2000 (draft) Ministry of Lands, Resettlement and Rehabilitation, Windhoek, Namibia. pp13

Mathews, C. 2001 Namibia's Biomass Energy Programme in northern Namibia. Working document. Desert Research Foundation of Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia.

- Minister of Environment and Tourism Speech, 1998: *The Policy and Vision of the Environment and Tourism Portfolio*, Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Namibia.
- Pallett, J.(ed) 1997 Sharing Water in Southern Africa. Desert Research Foundation of Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia. pp121
- Parenzee, L. 2000 Testing biodiversity indicators for community use – a case study from Namibia. GTO Conference, March 2000, Würzburg.
- Quan, J., D. Barton & C. Conroy. 1994. A preliminary assessment of the economic impact of desertification in Namibia. Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Windhoek, Research Discussion Paper, No 3. 148 pp.
- Sandford, S., 1995. Improving the efficiency of opportunism: new directions for pastoral development. In Scoones, I. (ed.), *Living with Uncertainty*, IIED, London, UK, p. 174-182
- Scoones, I. (ed), 1995. *Living with Uncertainty: New directions in pastoral development in Africa*. IIED, London
- SDP 1994 Kuiseb Catchment Project Summer Desertification Project. Occasional paper. Desert Research Foundation of Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia.
- SDP 1995. An investigation into the biophysical and socio-economics of desertification in north-western Namibia. DRFN Occasional Paper 2, Desert Research Foundation of Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia.
- SDP 1996 A study of desertification at Engelbrecht. Occasional paper. Desert Research Foundation of Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia.
- SDP 1999 Development options for resettlement in northeast Otjozondjupa. Occasional paper. Desert Research Foundation of Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia.
- SDP 8 2000 Determining the water reserve of the Kuiseb River – sustainable use of Namibia's ephemeral rivers, lifelines for development. Occasional paper. Desert Research Foundation of Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia.
- Seely, M.K. 1998 Can science and community action connect to combat desertification. In "Combating desertification: connecting science with

community action" Special issue. International symposium and workshop, 12-16th May 1997, Tucson, Arizona, USA. "Combating Journal of Arid Environments 39(2): 267-277.

Seely, M.K. 1999. Desertification In Namibia: Rural - Urban Interactions. Paper presented at: UNCCD Conference of Mayors, Bonn.

Seely, M.K. & Jacobson, K.M. 1994 Desertification and Namibia: a perspective. *Journal of African Zoology* 108(1): 21-36

Stiles, D. (ed.) 1995. Social aspects of sustainable dryland management. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. 313 pp.

SWAPO Manifesto 2000, SWAPO Party, Windhoek, Namibia. pp23

Toulmin, C., 1995. Tracking through drought: options for destocking and restocking. In Scoones, I. (ed.), *Living with Uncertainty*. IIED, Oxon, UK, p. 95-115

UCT. 1997. A retrospective assessment of the environmental impacts of emergency borehole supply in the Gam and Khorixas areas of Namibia. In: *Environmental and Geographical Science Master Class*. Department of Environmental and Geographical Science, Cape Town. 187 pp.

UCT. 1998. A retrospective assessment of environmental implications of resettlement. . University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa.

UNCCD 1996. United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in those countries experiencing serious drought and/ or desertification, particularly in Africa. Text with annexes. 71 pp.

UNCOD 1977. United Nations Conference on Desertification, Nairobi, Kenya.

UNDP 1998 Namibia Human Development Report: Environment and Human Development in Namibia, United Nations Country Team, UNDP, Windhoek, Namibia.

Water Bill 2000 Draft Water Act Namibia Water Resource Management Review, Windhoek, Namibia

Wildlife Management, Utilisation and Tourism in Communal Areas Policy 1995, Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Windhoek, Namibia.

Wolters S. (ed.) 1994. Proceedings of Namibia's National Workshop to Combat Desertification. Napcod, Desert Research Foundation of Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia. 214 pp.

Zeidler, J., Seely, M., Rahim, A. & Bruzak, G. 1999. Indicators and monitoring systems at a community and household level: A case study of the communal farm Olifantputs. Occasional papers series. Desert Research Foundation of Namibia.

Zeidler, J., 2000a. Establishing indicators of biological integrity in western Namibian rangelands. PhD thesis, Department of Animal, Plant and Environmental Sciences (APES), University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa.

Zeidler J. 2000b. Establishing indicators of biological integrity in western Namibian rangelands. GTZ, Eschborn. 55 pp.
