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Summary
The independence of Namibia in 1990 did not just brought political emancipation to its people, but it coincided with a time, when international ground breaking policies were made to reverse the protectionist conservation methods, which were practiced over vast areas of the African continent and in Namibia. With independence, the Namibian government was aimed at redressing the protectionist conservation methods, for local communal communities to be involved in wildlife management and to benefit from conservation. This has resulted in the amendment of the Nature Conservation Ordinance (4 of 1975), for the state to devolve user rights of land, wildlife and natural resources to communal communities which form legal institutions known as conservancies.

The development of conservancies in Namibia is regarded as the driving force behind natural resource conservation, tourism and rural development in communal areas. However, the scope of the devolution of these user rights, to conservancy members is contested by other policies, deployed in communal conservancies. The Uibasen Twyfelfontein conservancy was declared as a conservancy in 1999 and the state has devolved user rights of land, wildlife and natural resources to the Uibasen Twyfelfontein community to manage and to benefit from the conservation of resources in the conservancy. However, the National Heritage Council of Namibia, an organizational institution enacted by the Heritage Act of 2004 was also empowered to manage the country’s national heritage resources, including the Twyfelfontein World Heritage Site, situated within the boundary of the Uibasen Twyfelfontein Conservancy.

This study was aimed at understanding the operations of the Uibasen Twyfelfontein Conservancy and the National Heritage Council of Namibia as two policy arrangements which are employed over the same area and community. The study used the policy arrangement approach elements (actors, rules, resources and discourses), to analyze how the two arrangements have shaped processes in the conservancy. In addition to the policy arrangement approach, the sustainable livelihood approach was used to show the impacts of the arrangements on the livelihood activities of the local Uibasen Twyfelfontein conservancy community. The analysis of data for this study was gathered through: 24 interviews with key stakeholders, document reviews and observation.

The main outcome of the study revealed that the two arrangements advocate for the sustainable utilization of resources and both arrangements use tourism as a conservation strategy, and depend on tourism for their sustainability. In terms of conservation and its contribution to livelihoods, the
arrangements have managed to enhanced community’s livelihoods through employment creation for conservancy members, cash payments paid to individual conservancy members derived from tourism revenues and the empowerment of members through various trainings offered in the conservancy.

However, despite the benefits of the arrangements, there are several challenges in the deployment of the two policy arrangements in the conservancy. The arrangements are characterized by unequal power differences, which threaten the conservation of resources, while elites in the conservancy are acting in their own interest, by capturing the collective benefits that are meant for the community.

Even though the two arrangements reflect the broader conservation of resources, they differ in the process and function of attaining their aims and objectives, aspects which threaten the internal congruency of the arrangements.

The incongruences of the arrangements can create institutional instability, jeopardize the conservation of resources and deny livelihood benefits to the conservancy members.
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CHAPTER 1

1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Introduction

In the last century, the protection of wildlife and natural resources in most parts of Africa, predominantly has been done through the protectionism and preservation methods which had their origin in the ‘West’ (Adams, 2004; Roe, 2008). This top down protectionism, and conservationist discourses, headed by state approaches dominated the conservation of wildlife and natural resources in Africa and most parts of the developing ‘south’ (Adams, 2004; Roe, 2008). Even though these conservationist methods managed to protect large areas of wildlife in game parks and nature reserves, these methods proved unsustainable and backfired in most areas where it was implemented. The conservationist methods did not have the support of the locals as it exploited and victimized the marginalized rural communities, hence resulting in conflicts between park authorities and local rural communities (Adams, 2004; Roe, 2008).

These conservationist approaches were also practiced in Namibia and all wildlife was placed under centralized state control. Most communal parts of Namibia experienced a decline in wildlife and natural resources. This decline was partly as a result of the conservationist policies, which were known as ‘colonial conservation’ in Namibia, while natural conditions such as drought also played a role. Poaching was rampant as a response to the conservation policies however, the search for ivory and hades and the devastating drought of 1980, resulted in a sharp decrease of wildlife and an extinction of some wildlife species in Namibia’s communal areas.

People on communal land, had little or no reason to protect wildlife as they did not benefit from it and regarded wildlife as a threat to humans, crops, livestock and a competitor for water and grazing. Only the state and commercial farmers saw the benefit of protecting wildlife, as they benefited from it through tourism activities such as safaris and trophy hunting. However, no attempts were made to extend these rights and benefits to people in communal areas in Namibia.

The independence of Namibia in 1990, did not just brought political emancipation for its people, but coincided with a time, when international ground breaking policies were made to reverse the protectionist conservation methods. Policies which aimed to include the local people in decision making,
concerning the conservation of wildlife and natural resources were developed on international level. On global level, initiatives for community based approaches to wildlife management came as a result of the Brundtland commission (WCED, 1987) and the Rio de Janeiro United Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) (UNCED, 1992). Global environmental programs such as the Millennium Development Goals encouraged governments towards the sustainable conservation of natural resources and emphasized the need for the decentralization and the devolution of natural resources to communal communities and reinforced community participation (Adams, 2004; Roe, 2008; Ashley, 2001).

On local level, the conservation of wildlife dates back to the mid-1980s, after the devastating drought of 1980-1982, when the first community game guards were appointed by a local headmen in the North western part of Namibia, in an attempt to reverse the dwindling wildlife in that part of the country (NACSO, 2009; MET, 1995; IRDNC, 2011; Ashley & Roe, 1998). Prior to independence, rural communities had no rights to use wildlife, communities lack ownership of resources and formal management structures were nonexistent in rural communal areas. It was however this earlier community based conservation initiatives in Namibia which grew into the national CBNRM program.

In order for the Namibian government to adhere to its international obligations with regard to the conservation of ecosystem and bio diversity with independence, the state had to do something for local communities to be involved in wildlife management and to benefit from conservation. The government had to extend the rights enjoyed by commercial farmers regarding wildlife and tourism development to communal communities through legislation. This has resulted in the amendment of the Nature Conservation Ordinance (4 of 1975), for the state to devolve user rights of land, wildlife and natural resources to communal communities which form legal institutions known as ‘conservancies’.

On communal land, a ‘conservancy’ is a group of community members within the defined geographical area who jointly manage, conserve and utilize wildlife and other natural resources within a defined area (MET, 1995). The institutionalization of conservancies as legal entities on communal land has enabled communal communities to benefit financially from wildlife management and tourism development on conservancy land (MET, 1995). The Namibian government is therefore using communal conservancies through the CBNRM program to conserve the ecosystem and biodiversity, to alleviate poverty and to improve livelihood activities through tourism development.
Tourism Development

Tourism is heralded as a poverty alleviation strategy and a developmental tool, especially for developing countries rural poor (Ashley, 2000; Ashley & Roe, 1998; Spencely & Goodwin, 2007; Manyara & Jones, 2007). The perception that tourism can be used as a tool in the fight against poverty and the enhancement of local people living standards, has been reflected in international initiatives such as, the World Tourism Organizations Global Code of Ethics for Tourism (WTO, 1992), the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD, 1999), the United Nation Environmental Program Principles for the Implementation of Sustainable tourism (UNEP, 2001). The United Nation Commission on trade and Development, Sustainable Tourism Eliminating Poverty ST-EP program and the Millennium Development Goals (UN WTO, 2008) among others. All these programs and initiatives are aimed at the alleviation of poverty, the empowerment of local communities through their participation in tourism development and the advocacy for equitable distribution of socio-economic, cultural and environmental benefits derived from tourism (Spencely & Goodwin, 2007; Manyara & Jones, 2007).

Even though tourism is perceived as the panacea for development in many developing countries, it can have both positive and negative socio-economic and environmental impacts on local communities. Boudreaux (2010) noted, that tourism development is associated with social and environmental costs and can have adverse consequences especially for the targeted local community members, who are not always at the level required to understand issues related to tourism in general. Boudreaux further argue that tourism can address poverty through economic and non-economic approaches. He reiterates that economic approaches refer to ‘economic income and consumptions, while the non-economic, incorporates concepts such as vulnerability, isolation, powerlessness, inequality, self-respect and ownership of assets’ (Boudreaux, 2010).

Given the potential benefits of tourism development in developing countries, it is important to have a broader view when assessing its likely impacts, especially those that affect the socio economic aspects of the locals and which are aimed at addressing the potential strategies and outcomes which profit the local communities. It is therefore equally important to critically evaluate the empowering impact of tourism on local communities, by looking at it from a livelihood perspective.
Tourism in Namibia’s communal areas

Namibia as a developing country, has embraced tourism as a development tool, especially for its rural communal areas where national development schemes are difficult to reach. Tourism development in Namibia’s communal areas is threefold, it is used as a strategy to conserve natural resources, alleviate poverty and assist government with rural development. (NACSO, 2007; MET, 1995; National Planning Commission (NPC), 2000). Tourism is the third biggest contributor of GDP after mining and agriculture and one of the fast growing economic sectors in the country (NPC, 2000). The Namibian Government has recognized the potential role that tourism can play, in contributing to local economic development and poverty reduction. As such, the government has integrated tourism; not just in the sectorial tourism policy were the link between local benefits and poverty is noted, but into broader development policy and planning (Ashley & Roe, 1998; Roe, 2001). The Tourism development policy is in line with the National Development plans (NDPI- NDP IV), the National Poverty Reduction Action Program, and Namibia’s Vision 2030 (MET, 2004).

The successful realization of tourism development in Namibia’s communal areas is due to Namibia’s Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) program and its conservancy model. The body of tourism literature alleged that, Namibia’s conservancy model is one of the best models in Sub-Saharan Africa, in the sense that it overcame some of the bureaucrats and governing elite’s reluctance to transfer powers to local communities (Manyara & Jones, 2007). The development of conservancies in Namibia is regarded as the driving force behind natural resource conservation, tourism and rural development in communal areas. One of the CBNRM program main approaches, is to achieve conservation of wildlife and biodiversity with derivatives which will benefit the local communities through their participation in the conservation of these resources (NACSO, 2005); a move which is not just aimed at resource protection but which seek to alleviate extreme poverty, compliment livelihood income and foster livelihood strategies among Namibia’s rural poor.

Although tourism is meant to contribute to poverty alleviation, improve livelihood outcomes and empower local people, this may not always be the case in Namibia. Despite the accolade of the conservancy model, local communities in communal conservancies have not yet ‘captured the lions share’ from tourism activities (Novelli, & Gebhardt, 2007), especially those that are meant to trickle down to the poorest members of the community. Variables such as a lack of a clear and understandable conservation policy, unclear roles and responsibilities of local communities and operators on
conservancy land; impatience and community’s attitudes towards risk are some reasons given as constraints that hinder conservancy members to maximize on the potential benefits generated by tourism development in their areas (NACSO, 2010).

Beside these variables, tourism also came as a new land use strategy for most rural communities in Namibia’s communal conservancies. However, the implication of this new land use strategy was initially geared towards poverty alleviation, rural development and the diversification of livelihoods.

The Namibian government CBNRM program premise is to empower the locals who were previously disadvantaged by the apartheid conservation laws. The aim of Namibia’s Nature Conservation Amendment Act of 1996, is to promote the conservation of natural resources as a strategy which should translate into tourism development, alleviate poverty and assist government with rural development (MET, 1995). The Act made conservancy members the partial owners of natural resources and wildlife, falling within the boundaries of their conservancies. It also enabled them to lease their land to private tourism operators, joint venture partners, and individual entrepreneurs or use the land for community based tourism initiatives. These activities should contribute to the financial or socio economic benefits of the conservancy and its members (MET, 1995).

However, the scope of the devolution of these user rights, assets and resources to conservancy members is contested by other policies, institutions and tourism operators that are deployed in communal conservancies hence, making the operations of such institutions on conservancy land ambiguous, not just to the conservancy members but to outsiders alike.

This study is aimed at examining the operations of one such institution, the National Heritage Council of Namibia (NHC), which operate within the boundary of the Twyfelfontein Uibasen Conservancy (UTC). The NHC, which is a parastatal or semi-private organization, was enacted by the Heritage Act of 2004 and is responsible for the management of all heritage sites in the country, including the Twyfelfontein World Heritage Site (TWHS). The study sought to understand the relation between the NHC and UTC, as two arrangements employed over the management of resources in the conservancy. The study further attempted to understand how the implications of these arrangements, impact upon the livelihood assets, outcomes and strategies of the conservancy members. The study also compared the livelihood outcomes of conservancy members employed by NHC, with those employed by other tourism operators in the conservancy.
Tourism operations in UTC, is a multifaceted industry were a number of different stakeholders are involved. It is hence essential, that the roles responsibilities and expectations of all parties, especially those of the local community and the different operators and organizations potential are realistically raised to transform livelihood situations. If these expectations are not realized and if some partakers are not aware of their roles, it can render the conservancy agenda unsustainable, consequently affecting livelihoods, and impoverish future generations.

1.1 Problem background of the study area
The study is based on UTC, one of the smallest, least populated, yet most visited communal conservancy in the renowned tourism potential hub of Namibia’s Kunene region. The conservancy contains a very small population of approximately 300 people distributed over an area of 286km² (NACSO, 2013).

The area was declared as a communal conservancy in December 1999 (NACSO, 2008) and with the partial user rights brought by MET to communal conservancies, the area became a legal natural asset to its members. Even though the famous Twyfelfontein rock art was declared as a national heritage site in the late 1950’s (Gwasira, 2005), the natural and cultural endowments of the site only gained instant fame with the declaration of Twyfelfontein as a world heritage site in 2007. The conservancy has since seen an influx of tourist and an increase in tourism development.

Beside the benevolent conditions brought by the declaration of the area as a conservancy, natural shocks such as frequent droughts continue to hamper farming activities in the conservancy. These conditions have increased the vulnerability of the locals who are small stock farmers, and have impelled farmers to use tourism as a tool to complement and enhance their livelihood outcomes. The new status of Twyfelfontein as a world heritage site has also resulted in an influx of immigrants vying for employment opportunities, and to be registered as potential conservancy members. This new turn of events have jeopardized local’s chances for employment and have resulted in lower or insignificant attainment of benefits through the distribution of benefits which accrued from tourism.

With the declaration of the area as a communal conservancy, the UTC management became the legal custodian of natural resources in the area and was also responsible to oversee the heritage site on behalf of the National Monument Council (NMC). The South African National Monuments Act (Act 21 of 1969) was still the legislation responsible for the management of heritage sites in Namibia after independence (Gwasira, 2005). The NMC was however, experiencing problems in managing the heritage sites, mainly due to the fact that it was not well capacitated to establish its presence on the ground. The
arrangement was; that the conservancy management took responsibility to conserve, observe and to report any violation of the National Monuments Act, while the NMC was responsible for the enforcement of the law (Gwasira, 2002).

In the absence of an appropriate National Heritage Act, which could cater for the interest of an independent Namibia, the NMC have appropriated legislative policies developed for other forms of heritage, to manage its heritage resources. One such adopted policy was MET policy on the establishment of conservancies and the policy on Wildlife Management, Utilization and Tourism development in Communal Areas of 1995 (also known as the Communal Conservancy Policy). The communal conservancy policy was developed on the assumptions that the natural heritage resources can be harvested and used in a sustainable manner by the members themselves. This meant devolution of power to manage the heritage at the community level, hence viewing the heritage product as its own and assuming responsibility for its continuity (Gwasira, 2002).

However, with the passing of the Heritage Act of 2004, the NHC has taken over the complete management of all archeological and cultural heritage sites in Namibia including the TWHS, leaving the UTC management with no mandate over the heritage site. The NHC is not subjected to MET Communal Conservancy Policy and operate as a legal entity on land which is demarcated to the NHC in the conservancy. Even though the Heritage Act and MET Communal conservancy policy are complimentary in text and are administered over the same area and community, the NHC is having a different mandate when the management of resources is concerned. However, there are possibilities for complementarities, or better implementation of both policies to improve the livelihoods of the conservancy members and it is exactly these possibilities that this study has sought to investigate.

1.2 Problem statement
The declaration of the UTC in December 1999, marked a period were livelihood assets such as partial user rights to wildlife and natural resources, became the collective ownership of conservancy members. However, given the tourism potential of the area, prospecting private tourism operators were already undertaking tourism operations in the area, prior to the registration of the area as a conservancy. Even though all existing tourism establishments on conservancy land were required to apply for new lease holds, through the land boards which the conservancy has to approve; some tourism operators were still not registered with the conservancy. This situation has rendered the conservancy management vulnerable in negotiating better deals for its members and has left the conservancy management with minimal options to develop community based tourism initiatives.
A study done by Roe (2001) on partnership and conservation in UTC revealed that some of the agreements with tourism operators in the conservancy were marked by controversy. Roe further remarked that even though the Permission To Occupy land (PTO) was annulled with the establishment of the UTC in 1999 and was replaced with leaseholds, which should be registered in the UTC name, some local people leased out their PTO’s to prospecting tourism investors and did not transfer them into the conservancy name, a move which is firstly in contravention with the MET guidelines, and secondly something that has put the conservancy management committee in a weak position to negotiate a good deal for its members (Roe, 2001).

Another controversy was noted with the Abba-Huab campsite. The campsite was owned by an individual entrepreneur prior to the area being registered as a conservancy. Given the tourism attributes of the area, the owner of the Abba - Huab campsite was solely benefiting from the natural assets by charging visitors fees to tourist visiting the rock engravings at Twyfelfontein (Roe, 2001). Due to the individual ownership rather than community ownership of the campsite, the local people working at the campsite were only receiving wages rather than shares in the profits from the natural assets (Roe, 2001). Besides the benign conditions for tourism operations in the UTC, the impact these operators are having on the livelihood outcomes of the conservancy members is not known.

Another problem is the operation and the management of TWHS by NHC on conservancy land. The state in Namibia owns all the communal land and has ultimate control over it. The National Heritage Act of 2004 stipulates that the NHC have legal rights on any land where national heritage sites are found, even when these sites are situated on conservancy land. However, the government have also entrusted conservancies as ‘on the ground’ proprietors of land. Traditional authorities and community land boards are also custodians of land in communal areas. This divide between ownership and responsibility over land tenure in communal areas creates uncertainty and unclear legal roles and responsibilities of stakeholders, hence affecting the livelihood outcomes of the local community (Roe, 2001).

The operations and the relations that exist between the NHC and the conservancy management regarding the management of TWHS are not well known. Policy procedures concerning resource sharing between the community members the NHC and tourism operators are not very clear, and the relations between operators and their contribution towards the livelihood of the community members in the conservancy are also obscure.
It is against these backgrounds that the study tried to understand the operations of the two policy arrangements on one area and community, and the implications of these arrangements on the relations between the NHC and the UTC in managing the TWHS. The study further sought to understand if and how the operations of the NHC, the conservancy office and the tourism operators impact the livelihood assets, strategies and outcomes of conservancy members, and in conclusion the study drew a comparison of livelihood outcomes of conservancy members employed by NHC and those employed by private tourism operators in the UTC.

1.3 Research objectives and research questions

The main objective of the study is to understand the employment of two policy arrangements over the same area and community and the implications of these policies on relations in the management of resources in UTC. The study also pursued to investigate how the two arrangements impact upon the livelihood assets, strategies and outcomes of conservancy members, by answering the following research questions:

1. **What are the power relations between NHC and UTC as two policy arrangements and how congruent are these arrangements in achieving their intended objectives in the Conservancy?**

   a) What are the consequences of the implementation of two policy arrangements, for the Uibasen Twyfelfontein conservancy community?

   b) What are the similarities and differences between the two arrangements in terms of the rules, actors involved, resources and the discourses that exist in the conservancy?

2. **How are the different operators (UTC, NHC the private and local tourism operators); impacting upon the livelihoods of the conservancy members?**

   a) What are the livelihoods in the conservancy? And how and to what extend are the different operators helping the local conservancy members to complement their livelihoods in terms of assets, strategies and outcomes?

   b) To what extend do the livelihoods assets, strategies and outcomes of members employed by the NHC differ from those employed by the various tourism operators in the conservancy?
1.4 Significance of the study
The conservancy model in Namibia is used as a tool to assist government in the conservation of wildlife and natural resources in communal areas. In addition, the model also aims for the establishment of development interventions which will contribute to the diversification and the enhancement of livelihoods in conservancies as well as aid with general rural development.

Empirically, this study was undertaken as a contribution to the broader understanding of the operations of the NHC as a parastatal, within the borders of a communal conservancy, and how it manage and conserve resources on conservancy land. The study also aimed at understanding the implications of the employment of two policies over the same area and community and how these arrangements affect the local community. The study employed the Policy Arrangement Approach (PAA) in analysing the actors, rules, discourses and relations that exist between the different stakeholders in the management of resources in UTC. The Sustainable Livelihood Framework (SLF) was used as a tool to evaluate the link between resource conservation, tourism development and the enhancement of conservancy member’s livelihoods assets, strategies and outcomes. The various aspects of these theoretical conceptualisations are further explained in chapter 2.

The findings of the study can be used in the implementation of policies to make the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders in the conservancy more explicit. The results of the study are also expected to guide the operations of NHC and to redefine its policy regarding community participation and benefit sharing when its operations are situated on conservancy land. Researchers and tourism developers, interested in measuring socio economic impacts of tourism in communal conservancies will find the study and its results useful in directing future research.

1.5 Structure of the thesis
This thesis consists of five chapters. The first chapter contains a general introduction about the genesis of conservation in Namibia and it also gave an overview of conservation and tourism development in Namibia’s communal conservancies, and the research questions are also presented in this chapter.

Chapter 2 covers the theoretical and analytical frameworks used for the study. It also gives an account of the methodological choices used, such as the types of data collected, the sources of data, and methods of data analysis, as well as the limitations of the study.

Chapter 3 present the empirical findings, starting with an overview or historical development of events that led to the unravelling of events in the UTC. The chapter used the four dimensions of the policy
arrangement approach (PAA) to analyse the two policies in the conservancy. The chapter start with the identification of actors and the relations that exist between these players in terms of rules, and the access to resources in the conservancy. This is followed by the reflection of relations in discourses and the implications of the two arrangements on the conservancy community, before the chapter is concluded.

Chapter 4 describe the implications of the different operators; on the livelihoods assets, and outcomes of conservancy members. A comparison of the livelihood assets, outcome and strategies of conservancy members employed by the NHC and those employed by other tourism operators in the Conservancy are also presented. The chapter is then concluded with a discussion on how the different operators complement the local community’s livelihood strategies, and how they buffer the local community against vulnerabilities. Finally, chapter 5 gives a brief discussion of the main study findings, and an overall conclusion of the thesis, which is followed by some recommendations.
CHAPTER 2

2 POLICY ARRANGEMENT AND LIVELIHOODS: THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ACCOUNTS

Introduction

Chapter 2 reflects on the theoretical and methodological choices of this study. Two arrangements are presented in this study, The Communal Conservancy Policy of 1995 and the Heritage Act of 2004. These laws are both aimed at the sustainable conservation and preservation of resources, and are employed over the same area and community. To evaluate the policy aspects, processes and their implications on the UTC community, the policy arrangement approach (PAA) was employed as a theoretical tool, while the sustainable livelihood framework (SLF) was used to understand the impacts of the two arrangements on the livelihood activities of the UTC community.

Furthermore, a brief discussion is made on the conceptual framework and the chapter ends with a presentation of the methods used during the study.

2.1 The Policy Arrangement Approach (PAA)

The policy arrangement approach has its roots in the establishment of organizations and the processes of such organizations or structures. The policy arrangement approach (PAA) is built upon theories such as discourse analysis e.g. (Hajer, 1995), various policy network approaches (Glasbergen, 1989; Marsh & Rhodes, 1992) and the advocacy coalition approach (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1993; cited by Liefferink, 2006). The framework stems from the existence of policy structures and institutions in society which can shape the behavior and actions of members involved. The role of policy in the conservation-development nexus can be used to strengthen livelihoods, conserve and promote the sustainable utilization of natural resources, and to fight poverty.

Policy formations derive from the need, to create control over space and place and over humans and objects. Wies (1994) noted that ‘policies may be used to define a domain, and they can initiate or change the characteristics of ongoing management activities’. In the case of Twyfelfontein heritage site, the introduction of NHC as a new actor has changed the traditional management of Twyfelfontein heritage site, once resting in the hands of the conservancy management, to a new system where the conservation and protection of archeological sites at Twyfelfontein became the prime responsibility of the NHC.
(Van der Zouwen, 2006) noted that policies do exist in different spheres of life and in different domains and change over time according to circumstances and conditions of their operation. However, this change and stabilization is based on the arrangement in place.

The premise of the policy arrangement approach is to connect daily changes of policy practices to broader institutional changes in society, with the aim to analyze and understand the changes these arrangements can bring to stakeholders or members concerned (Liefferink, 2006). Policy brings about change to institutions within a society and is not devoid of power which is at times covert and which can determine or influence different reactions from different players. Liefferink (2006) refer to a policy arrangement as governance where different actors take part in policy creation and the implementation of written and unwritten rules which governs people’s behavior. Tatenhove et., al (2000) define a policy arrangement as the temporary stabilization of the content and organization of a particular policy domain and how it is shaped in terms of organization and substance (cited in Wiering & Arts, 2006), while van der Zouwen (2006) presented a policy arrangement as a bridging concept, linking daily and structural processes. For the operationalization of PAA in this study I employed the definition by Tatenhove et al., 2000.

PAA is made out of 4 dimensions which are aimed at describing the day to day policy processes. The arrangement consists of 1) actors and coalitions, 2) resources and power, 3) rules of the game and 4) discourses. The first three dimensions are categorized as those dealing with the organizational aspects of a policy while discourses deal with the aspects of substance (Liefferink, 2006). The organizational aspects in this study refers to actors, rights, resources and procedures while substance refers to the rules, objectives and functions of actors within the domain of conservation and the management of resources. Liefferink tetrahedron, portrays the interconnection of the 4 dimensions of PAA, noting that all 4 dimensions are inextricably linked to one another, hence cannot be meaningful when studied in isolation, since a change in one contributes to a change in another (Liefferink, 2006).

As noted by Liefferink (2006) and van der Zouwen (2006) the policy arrangement is a concept packed with power, as it influence the outcome and impact of policy in an environment. Policy arrangements, “do not operate in a vacuum but form part of a society” (Liefferink, 2006; p.49). This means that any change in the structure of a policy arrangement results into changes in society which can have adverse or favorable effects on the society or community over which the policy arrangement is deployed. The
changes brought by the two interventions in UTC and their implications on the local community and conservation were studied under the four dimensions of PAA.

**Actors and coalitions**

Actors and their coalitions are identified as the relevant players who have an influence on the policy domain. They determine who is involved in the policy under consideration, which power relations exist between them and they determine the institutional context in which they operate (Arts & Tatenhove, 2004; Liefferink, 2006; see also Tatenhove et., al 2000). Wiering & Arts (2006) have categorized actors under the organizational aspect of the policy arrangement, which include actor constellations, interaction patterns, coalitions and oppositions. According to Arts & Tatenhove (2004), coalitions consist of a number of players who share the same resources, have (more or less) a similar understanding of the policy discourses and identifies similar policy goals. They are then using the policy to achieve these goals. The differences between actors are to a great extent based on their power relations, thus creating allies and enemies among the players or actors and their coalitions (Arts & Tatenhove, 2004). It is therefore important to note that actors determine or influence the interaction with other actors and coalitions involved in the policy.

With the new status of Twyfelfontein as a world heritage site, the area has attracted a number of actors and coalitions, while new concepts and narratives have evolved and developed, changing the environment of the area and the conservancy. The study analyzes the power relations that exist between the different actors and their coalitions in UTC. It also considers the different coalitions and how they support or challenge certain values in the conservancy. This is done by looking at who is involved in the coalitions, why they are involved and what their implications are on the policy domain. By understanding the coalitions, it will also help to understand how the two arrangements are interpreted by the different actors in the conservancy.

**Rules**

Rules of the game refer to the current operations which include the formal and informal procedures of decision making and interactions (Liefferink, 2006). Rules consist of “legislations”, “procedures” and “political culture”. Legislations refer to the formal binding rules such as agreements, constitutions and memorandum of understanding. Procedures refer to the informal rules and routine of interaction, while political culture denote to the beliefs held by actors in the policy domain (Giddens, 1984; Rittberger, 1993; cited by Wiering & Arts, 2006).
Legislation therefore, formalizes the policy into binding laws which must be adhered to by all players in the game. ‘Rules define the way the game should be played and within which boundaries, how issues should be framed, decisions made and through which procedures allocation of resources and division of authority and competencies should be conducted’ (Arts & Buizer, 2009; p.4).

Rules are more than just the formalization of laws and rulemaking, but also include ‘access rules’, interaction rules and policy styles (Kickert et al., 1997; cited by Arts & Buizer 2009), which can bring about change in the policy domain. Arts & Buizer (2009) argue that the domain of rules have been open up to include concepts such as participation, multi stakeholder’s dialogue, (including indigenous people) and interactive policy making. In Twyfelfontein the issue of participation is a delicate issue between the NHC and the conservancy management, while real access has to be fought for and defended by the conservancy management more, than other players in the conservancy, due to the power relations that exist between the NHC and the UTC concerning the access to the TWHS.

In this study, the rules of the game refer to legislations, agreements, procedures for participation and norms that governs the operations and the management of resources in UTC, and how the formal and informal procedures and routines of interaction have influenced the relations among actors in the conservancy. Furthermore, the study also examines whether these rules have provided the involvement (participation) of the conservancy management as representative of the conservancy members in decision making, and in the sharing of resources and benefits. The study further explains how the enactment and the operationalization of the two arrangements have caused problems which have resulted in resistance and the formation of coalitions. In addition it elaborates on how the rules of the two arrangements have shaped the outcome of the Uibasen Twyfelfontein community.

**Resources and power**

Resources and power are integrally connected to each other, as resource dependency and resource distribution is linked to the power relations that exist between players. Power can serve two purposes in the distribution of resources. On the one hand power can be used to mobilize resources to achieve particular outcomes in social relations, and on the other hand it can be used as an organizational or institutional tool, where interactive agents use the institution to achieve certain policy outcomes (Arts & Tatenhove, 2004). Power is thus used in the distribution of resources in society.

Wiering & Arts (2006) have categorized resource and power under organizational aspects, where resource constellations, power relations and political influences serve as indicators of change. Resource constellations make out the assets that policy makers have and which they can mobilize and assert
power over e.g. authority, knowledge money, technology etc. Different actors are having different resources and power within a particular policy arrangement, but there are always some dominant actors who control more resources (authority, influence money or more knowledge) than others (Wiering & Arts, 2006). In UTC some actors are having power due to their position in society, or due to particular rules that give them power over resources than other actors. Power is therefore everywhere and cannot simply be explained within the realm of resources. Resources and assets are therefore not equally distributed among actors; however, these inequalities in power relations are dynamic and can change over time and space.

In the context of this study, I limited my analysis to resources and power relations that exist between actors in the conservancy. To analyse the resources and power relations that exist in UTC, the study identified the actors involved in the policy arrangements, and the influence they have over resources. The study was aimed at understanding who the owner(s) of resources are, who is having access to resources and which rules guide resource utilization. In addition the study also evaluates the implications of resource distribution on the community livelihoods. The study also examined how the organisational aspects are used to achieve the policy outcomes and how the implications of the policy outcomes impact upon the livelihood outcomes of the Uibasen Twyfelfontein community and whether or not these outcomes are influenced by power or access to resources.

**Discourses**

Discourses are sets of ideas, concepts buzzwords and stories, which when combined, give a meaning to the real world (Hajer, 1995; Wiering & Arts, 2006). In tourism studies, concepts such as sustainable tourism, volunteerism, ecotourism and corporate social responsibility are some buzzwords that portray a desirable language to a world of inequality and degradation. In UTC, conservation, sustainable utilization of resources and participation are some buzzwords that are depicted in the formal rules in the conservancy. These words are more than buzz words as it serves a particular way of thinking that is recognized by a particular group of people, e.g. MET, the conservancy members and tourism operators, who tend to share the same way of thinking. Liefferink (2006) distinguished between two levels of discourses, namely those that are at governance level and which refer to general ideas about the organization of society, and those that are concerned with ideas about the concrete policy problems at stake, e.g. about the character of the problem, its causes and possible solutions. Discourses at the second level involve substantive or functional strategic positions of actors in the arrangement.
study sought to understand the problems of the two arrangements on the local community and how it influenced the functions and relations of actors in the conservancy.

Discourses are useful concepts as they help to construct or give meaning on ‘how a certain subject or topic is talked and thought about and how it is represented to others (Hall, 1992; p.295 cited by Ahebwa 2012). Discourses also encompass the element of power, how it circulates and how it is contested (Mowforth & Munt, 2009). The existence of the communal conservancy policy and the implementation of the NHC policy in the conservancy, presents a case of ‘competition’ among the different actors as they try to put their message across. Discourses can therefore weaken or enforce the position of actors in a policy domain.

This study examined the discourses surrounding the TWHS and UTC, by trying to understand particular storylines such as participation, benefit sharing and accesses to resources as enshrined in the policy documents, in relation to the implementation of the two arrangements. The study also examined the objectives of the NHC as a new player in terms of core decision making with the Conservancy Management Committee (CMC) and the levels of community participation in the management of the heritage site. This was done to understand the objectives of the two arrangements and whether or not they have achieved their required outcomes in the conservancy. The study also pursued to understand if the arrangements contribute to the effective realization of the desired policy outcomes, by understanding whether the policies are internally or externally congruent. Internal congruence mean the coherence level of the policies, to the four dimensions of the policy arrangement approach, while external congruence signify the degree to which the policies are rooted in the wider conservation and development (Arts & Goverde, 2006).

The application of PAA dimensions is critical in the further analysis of livelihoods of local communities in UTC. The four dimensions do not just sum up a policy arrangement but are interwoven; meaning a change in one dimension can trigger a change in the other dimensions (Liefferink, 2006). For example, the entry of NHC as a new actor can mean a new or additional financial resource in the conservancy which necessitates new guiding rules. These processes might in turn influence the prevailing discourses and influence resource allocation which subsequently might either positively or negatively impact upon the sustainable livelihood strategies and outcomes of local community members.
2.2 THE SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOOD FRAMEWORK (SLF)

The livelihood concept is not a new notion, but dates back to the 1940’s through the 1960’s and 70’s, describing the ways and means people made a living (Kaag et al., 2008; cited by Ahebwa, 2012). The term ‘sustainable livelihoods’ was used by the Worlds Commission on Environment and Development in 1987 with reference to discussions including ownership, basic needs and rural livelihood security (Brocklesby et al., 2003; cited by Ahebwa, 2012). The term was later linked to socio-economic and environmental conservation by the UN conference on Environment and Development in the early 1990s. The Brundtland Commission Report of 1987, which focused on ensuring sustainable development across the world, is since used as the yardstick for the development of the sustainable livelihood literature.

The rationale of the sustainable livelihood theory is based on ways of eradicating poverty by understanding how poor people live their lives and how the importance of policies, structural and institutional issues can assist the poor in improving their livelihoods. (Chambers & Conway, 1992; Ashley & Carney, 1999; Simpson, 2009). The common standpoint of the SLF is believed to be people centered, hence putting the needs of people first, while the benchmark of its success is based on whether the sustainable improvement of people livelihoods have taken place or not (Ashley & Carney, 1999).

The Sustainable Livelihood framework points out five key elements which are: (1) The vulnerability context (shocks trends and seasonality), (2)Livelihood assets (including different kinds of capital such as human, social, physical, natural, and financial capital resources), (3)Transforming structures and processes (were structures incorporates elements such as levels of government, private sectors while processes refer to laws, policies, culture and institutions) (4)Livelihood strategies (productive activities, investment strategies reproductive choices) and (5)Livelihood outcomes (wellbeing, reduced vulnerability and more income) (DFID, 1999).

The role of policy in general is to strengthen livelihoods, conserve natural resources and to empower the poor. In UTC the conservancy policy, NHC, and the private tourism operators represent the transforming structures and processes, which can either constrain or encourage human development in the conservancy. The livelihood activities of the community are determined by the two arrangements which can be approved or disapproved by the local community. The outcome of this (approval or disapproval) can cause debates, attract new actors or call for the amendment of the policy rules.
The communal conservancy policy of Namibia has enabled people living in communal areas to benefit from wildlife and natural resources in their areas and to become fully involved in the management of these resources, in order to derive benefits from them. A major goal of the sustainable livelihood framework is to assist with the improvement of the livelihoods of the poor people (Ashley, 2001). However, whether the livelihood conditions and the wellbeing of people in the UTC have been improved remains unknown and it is the gap that this study sought to fill.

In this study, the SLF is seen in the light of the two arrangements employed in the area. Since both interventions are concerned with the conservation aspect of resources, the study investigates whether the livelihood priorities and activities of the local people were considered within the arrangements. The study also examined the implications of these arrangements on the livelihood assets and outcomes of the conservancy community. The study further examined the contribution of the arrangements on the livelihood strategies of the local community and how the arrangements assist to buffer the vulnerabilities of people in the conservancy.

In using the SLF to investigate the implications of the two arrangements in UTC, I focused on four major elements of the framework. The impacts of the policy implications on the capital assets and their related effects on the livelihood outcomes of the conservancy members, as well as the impacts of the two arrangements on the strategies of the local community and how they assist to buffer the vulnerability context of members in the conservancy.

**Policy implications on capital assets and associated livelihood outcomes**

**a) Livelihood outcomes**

With the SLF, capital assets are used in pursuit of generating livelihood outcomes (Scoones, 1998). The livelihood outcome is very critical for poverty alleviation, as it is one of the most visible and tangible outcomes of the SLF. According to the body of literature on SL, a livelihood is only sustainable if people are able to maintain or improve their standard of living, related to wellbeing and income or other human development goals (Goodwin & Roe, 2001).

Ashley (2001) argues that it is important to assess how people lived before and during development in their area, to have a better understanding of their livelihood outcomes. She further emphasizes that individual income and collective cash incomes are the prime motivation for rural communities to conserve resources and to develop their area (Ashley, 2001).
The two arrangements in UTC are influencing tourism operations in the conservancy. The study investigates whether the implications of the two arrangements address the livelihood outcomes of the community, based on tourism development in the conservancy. The livelihood capital assets are believed to translate into livelihood outcomes which include employment opportunities, the provision of social services, the wellbeing and the empowerment of members. Livelihood outcomes can lead to positive impacts such as earnings from employment, the core management of natural and cultural resources and the revalorization of the local tradition and culture which in turn empower locals and enhance stronger human and social capital. This paper investigate whether the operational policies have shaped the locals livelihood assets, and whether this operations have contributed to livelihood outcomes of members in the conservancy, such as access to transport or health centers. In this study, livelihood outcomes shall be among others, access to electricity for development and diversification of livelihood outcomes, employment created, tourism knowledge and skills gained, access to education, the empowerment of the local community and the nurturing of pride and ownership among the locals in the sustainable management and conservation of natural and cultural resources.

b) Livelihood capital assets

The livelihood approach believes that an accurate and realistic understanding of people strengths determines their assets or capital endowments (DFID, 1999). How they attempt to convert these endowments into positive livelihood outcomes will influence their livelihood priorities. However, a range of assets is required to achieve positive livelihood outcomes (DFID, 1999). Capital assets such as unspoilt landscapes, serene atmosphere, natural resources such as water, wood, wildlife, and social assets such as relationships of trust, social norms and ‘homogeneous’ communities are some capital assets in abundance in rural areas, but that rural communities are not aware of as assets which they can use as strengths to be converted into positive livelihoods outcomes. The study sought to investigate how the deployment of the two arrangements impact upon the livelihood assets of the local community and which positive livelihood outcomes are as a result of the arrangements in the conservancy. In this study the five capital assets of the sustainable livelihood framework are operationalised as follows: (Ashley & Hussein, 2000)

1. Human capital

Human capital refers to knowledge, skills and competencies acquired through access to education, various trainings and in service training provided to members, bursary schemes provided towards member’s education and skills attained that members can utilize to establish other businesses.
2. Physical capital
Physical capital refers to tourism institutions such as lodges, built infrastructures such as schools, offices and vehicles. Infrastructure developments such as better roads, connection to the national grid line, and network connection, which local members can use as developmental tools or strategies to improve their livelihoods.

3. Social capital
Social capital refers to social networks and associations formed in the conservancy, elements of trust and cooperation developed among the different actors and a sense of pride cultivated among members. It also refers to assistance rendered to vulnerable members of the conservancy such as the elderly and orphans, the provision of access to social services such as schools, hospitals and pension payments, participation and decision making of members in matters that concern their livelihood outcomes.

4. Natural capital
Natural capital refers to the land, biodiversity, natural resources such as wood, water, wildlife the scenery and the natural attractions in the area. These attributes can be used as reasons for the establishment of tourism institutions such as lodges and campsites from which the locals can derive an income to improve their livelihood outcomes.

5. Financial capital
Financial capital refers to income gained from being employed, cash payments paid to conservancy members as benefits for the conservation of resources. It also refers to financial resources such as bursaries, grants and loans availed to conservancy members, bed night levies paid by tourism operators to the conservancy fund, and businesses that opened in the conservancy due to tourism development.

Policy implications on livelihood strategies and on context

a) Livelihood Strategies
Livelihood strategies which simply translate ‘a means to make a living’ have developed into a dynamic concept in which all aspects of wellbeing are included (Schoones, 2009; cited by Diniz, 2013). Livelihood strategies that people use to achieve their livelihood goals are diverse in nature and differ between households and over time (Diniz, 2013). In order to understand people livelihood strategies it is important to know people livelihood assets. However, the access to the assets is determined by structures and processes such as the two arrangements in UTC and the rules, actors and procedures which can either prevent or support people gaining access to these assets (Ellis, 2000; Ashley, 2001; Roe, 2004). Access is also influenced by shocks being natural or man-made, such as policies, migration, population growth, economic changes and seasonality e.g. droughts. Even though these vulnerabilities
are factors outside the community control they can influence access to assets (Ellis, 2000 cited by Diniz, 2013). Therefore, the availability of assets, the processes and the vulnerability context together form the livelihood strategies of people (Diniz, 2013).

Since the sustainable livelihood approach main concern is people, the framework strives to put people at the centre of any development (DFID, 1999). It is important that policies are responsive to the local community’s needs and that these needs are incorporated into decisions made (DFID, 1999). Long term equitable distribution of resources and the consultation of all members in affairs that impact their livelihood strategies can have positive impacts and can enhance social and financial capital. When conservation earnings are invested in what the community need such as training and skills development, it can lead to long term equity, while natural resources enhance collective management and harness incentives to work together which result in stronger social organisation for resource management (Ashley, 2001).

In this study, the implications of the policy arrangements on livelihood strategies in the conservancy are activities undertaken by the local communities to improve their conditions of living such as operating small scale business in the conservancy, initiating development projects and improving social services such as education and healthcare. The study examined whether or not the local communities have diversified their economic activities, run projects, encouraged education, and advocated for social services to be brought nearer to them and whether these activities have increased their access to resources and decision making concerning their livelihood strategies in the conservancy.

b) Vulnerability Context

The Sustainable Livelihood Framework depicts the vulnerability context as the external environment in which people live (DFID, 1999). People’s livelihoods, especially the rural poor are affected by trends shocks and seasonality over which they have little or no control (Scoones, 1998) and due to their vulnerability people are caught up in a vicious cycle of poverty.

Shocks like the influx of immigrants to the UTC in search of employment opportunities, have increased the vulnerability of the local community’s prospects to be employed, and have caused fear among farmers for the loss of their livestock. Prolonged droughts in the area have led to competition for water between people wildlife and livestock. Beside the small size of UTC, the fragmentation of the conservancy into different land use zone has further decreased the land for livestock farmers, meaning even smaller grazing area for the sake of conservation. Elephants in the area don’t just use a lot of water and destroy infrastructure such as water points, they are also destroying garden projects. These
conditions have suppressed the locals’ ability to maximise on the livelihood strategies, to keep poverty at bay and have rendered the poor powerless as they have no alternatives to bounce back against these shocks.

However, favourable indicators such as the declaration of Twyfelfontein as a UNESCO World heritage site, and economic trends harboured by the tourism operations in the conservancy, can be used to buffer the communities against the vulnerabilities such as droughts and human wildlife conflict. This study examined how the arrangements are assisting and compensating the local community against the loss they suffer from tourism development and conservation and how they complement the local community’s livelihood strategies and buffer the community against the above mentioned shocks and trends which can render the local community vulnerable.

### 2.3 THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

According to Mouton & Marais (1990), a conceptual framework contains typologies, models and theories. They further delineate that typologies fulfils the function of classifying or categorising, while a model even though it classifies, it discover or “expose” certain relationships between concepts, and a theory even though it classify and discover its basic function is explanation or understanding (Marais & Mouton, 1990; p. 60). The framework used in this thesis is based on the policy arrangements approach and the Sustainable Livelihood framework, which includes activities such as assets, outcomes, strategies and the vulnerability context as the key aspects.

The institution of the communal conservancy policy was necessary, to alleviate extreme poverty in rural areas, to safeguard the dwindling wildlife caused by poaching, and to conserve natural resources such as wood and water which is under threat in communal areas. The policy’s main objective is to safeguard the sustainable use of natural resources, to provide incentives for the conservation of resources through the devolution of user rights and the encouragement of tourism development on conservancy land which should aid the livelihood outcomes of conservancy members. The preservation and conservation of the national cultural heritage on the other hand necessitated the institution of the NHC. The NHC is mandated to manage and preserve the country’s cultural heritage sites. Both policies are therefore responsible for the conservation and management of resources, and depend on tourism for their sustainability.

The framework used (see figure 2.1), seeks to visualise the linkages of concepts in this study. It shows how the theory of conservation explains the formation of conservancies and the NHC in the...
management and conservation of resources in UTC, and how the two arrangements impacted upon the livelihood activities of the UTC community.

The implications of the policy aspects (actors, resources, rules and discourses), are represented by the Heritage Act and the communal conservancy policy as the transforming structures, while the UTC, NHC and the tourism operators function as the transforming processes. These transforming processes can influence the livelihood assets, strategies and the vulnerability context of members and can indirectly influence the livelihood outcomes as seen by the arrows in figure 2.1. The livelihood assets which the community possess can influence the community’s livelihood strategies. The livelihood strategies in turn lead to livelihood outcomes. The livelihood outcomes can be ploughed back to strengthens the capital assets and can be used to cushion the community against some vulnerability. The livelihood activities of the local community will be greatly influenced by the implications of the arrangements in the conservancy.
The Conceptual Framework

Figure 2.1 The five main aspect of the Sustainable Livelihood Framework used for this thesis (adopted from DFID sustainable livelihood presentation)
2.4 Methodology

Study area

The UTC is one of the smallest communal conservancies, compared to most conservancies in Namibia, comprising an area of only 260km$^2$ and a population of approximately 300 people (NACSO, 2008). The conservancy is situated in the north western part of the Kunene region. It is surrounded by the Doro Nawas conservancy, of which it once belonged, before the area was proclaimed as a separate conservancy. The conservancy is endowed with tourism potential, ranging from the renowned rock engravings at TWHS, which is the main draw card for tourism in the region, to natural attractions such as the organ pipes, the burn mountains, as well as a beautiful scenery of red sandstone rock formations. The conservancy is also home to desert adapted wildlife species such as elephants, gazelle, ostriches cheetahs and some returning rhinos.

![Figure 2.2 Map of the study area (source: NACSO 2009)](image)

The conservancy is located in the Nama-Karoo biome, on the central western escarpment which is characterised by semi-arid conditions and sparse Mopane shrubland vegetation, with the exception of big trees found only along the ephemeral Aba-Huab river (Mosimane, 2001). Due to the semi-arid
conditions, day temperatures are high and rainfall is very unreliable. The average annual rainfall ranges between 100 and 200mm (Mendelson et al., 2002). Due to the harsh environmental conditions, agricultural production is not a viable option and only small stock farming is undertaken, due to the limited grazing and the lack of water in the area. These conditions have compelled most people to either emigrate to nearby towns to look for employment or to diversify their livelihoods. With the declaration of the area as a conservancy, tourism development became a preferred option for the diversification of livelihoods in the area.

With the declaration of the area as a conservancy, the employment potential of the area increased and the conservancy attracted a number of people from the surrounding areas and from towns as far as Khorixas. Employees from elsewhere can however not become registered members of UTC and can therefore not participate in the affairs or activities of the conservancy, as membership in UTC is by birth.

**Study design**

The study used the interpretivist case study research design. From an interpretivist perspective, “a case study research design strives towards a comprehensive (holistic) understanding of how participants relate and interact with each other in a specific situation and how they make meaning of the phenomenon under study” (Creswell et al., 2010; p.75). The research design was selected due to its capacity to offer a multi-perspective analysis, where different relevant groups of actors, including the marginalised members of the community and the interactions between them is studied, in order to give a better and deeper understanding of the dynamics of the situation (Creswell et al., 2010).

For this study, a sampled group of conservancy members were singled out for interviews. Tourism operators and NHC officials were also sampled for interviews. Similarly a sample of respondents was also selected from other groups such as (NACSO, NGOs, MET-Kunene Region and tertiary institutions such as the Polytechnic of Namibia). The collected data was analyzed to evaluate how the arrangements have influenced relations among the various actors, concerning the management and the conservation of resources and how the implications and outcomes of the two arrangements impacted upon the livelihood activities of the conservancy members.

**Methods of data collection**

The study employed a qualitative research method in collecting the needed data for this study. The use of qualitative analysis is favoured because it uses a naturalistic approach and the method seeks to
evaluate the performance of programmes in their natural settings, focusing on the process of implementation (Mouton, 2001). In collecting the needed qualitative data for this study, three different methods were employed, namely interviews, observation and document analysis. The methods were used to examine changes in rules, interaction patterns among actors concerning ownership of resources, access to resources and their effects on the livelihoods outcomes and strategies of the local conservancy community.

**Sampling procedures**

For the selection of respondents, a sample was done to identify the respondents to be interviewed. The people to be interviewed were divided into 2 groups, the local actors and the key informants (see figure 2.3). The first group consisted of the ‘internal or local’ actors (as I called them) which consist of the UTC Management Committee Members (CMC), the general conservancy members, the NHC officials at the site and managers of tourism institutions in the conservancy. The ‘external’ actors or a sample of people outside the conservancy formed the second group of respondents and contained the key informants which comprised of supporting organizations such as NACSO, MET-Kunene Region, NHC officials at the head office and officials from the tourism department at the Polytechnic of Namibia.

All key informants were selected purposefully based on their expertise in the field under study, and the judgmental sampling method was used for their selection. A representative number of respondents from the CMC and tourism managers in the conservancy were randomly selected, while conservancy members were selected by using the snowball method to identify other respondents to be interviewed. In total a number of 24 people were interviewed based on the two sampled groups, which consisted of 3 CMC, 11 conservancy members, 1 MET official from the Kunene regional office, 1 NACSO member, 3 members from NHC, 1 member from the Polytechnic of Namibia and 4 managers of tourism institutions in the conservancy.

The local actors such as the tourism operators, CMC, NHC and conservancy members were selected as they are influenced by the policy arrangements deployed in the conservancy, while NACSO was selected in its role as the umbrella body for conservancies representing other communal conservancies which might also be influenced by the operations of the NHC. MET Kunene Region was selected as representing MET on regional level, while the Polytechnic of Namibia was selected as an institution of tertiary education which plays an essential role in the formulation and advocacy of policies in the country through research.
Interviews
The interviews were semi-structured and an interview guide was used to guide the interview procedure. Three interview guides were developed (see appendix 1), one for the key informants or external respondents, another for the ‘internal or local’ management members such as the managers of the tourism institutions in the conservancy, the CMC and the HCN site manager. The third interview guide was used for the local conservancy members employed and those not employed in the conservancy. The questions were framed around the following themes.

a) Actors and resources
Under this theme, the respondents were asked to identify the people or organisations responsible for the management of resources in the conservancy. They were also asked how the different actors interact with each other and the community and the relationship that exist between themselves and the local community. Respondents were also asked how the NHC operates on conservancy land, what the levels of participations are with the conservancy members and what benefits the NHC is sharing with the community members, for their assistance in the preservation of TWHS.

b) Rules and discourses
Under this theme, respondents were asked what new rules were developed by the NHC as a new operator in the conservancy and how the new rules have affected the relations in the conservancy and whether the new rules recognized local community access to resources and benefits from the conservation of these resources. Furthermore, participants were also asked about agreements and procedures of participation.

c) Livelihood activities (assets, strategies, context and outcomes)
Under this theme respondents were asked how people makes a living, to determine people’s livelihood strategies. The respondents were also asked how the presence of the different operators (NHC, the conservancy office and tourism operators) influenced and are contributing to the community’s livelihood assets and outcomes and how they assist the local community to improve their livelihood strategies and protect them from vulnerabilities.

Field observation
Since livelihoods impacts, especially those at collective level, can best be obtained through observation (Mouton, 2001), observation was used in this study as a method of data collection. Maree (2010) define observation as ‘a systematic process of recording the behavioral patterns of participant’s, objects and
occurrences without communicating with them’ (Maree 2010; p. 85). I took the role of a participant observer and I followed events such as the NHC guide training sessions, and listen to the guide’s conversations. I also interviewed conservancy members in their homes in order to observe member’s livelihood outcomes and activities. The observations helped me to be able to pick up on unsaid cues which helped me to understand the situation under study. Furthermore, I used the observations to be able to compare the livelihood outcomes of members employed by different operators in the conservancy. The observations enabled me to compare the theories regarding discourses and rules and what actually took place on the ground, and then draw conclusions of the interaction patterns, resource distribution, rules and their resulting effects on the local community livelihoods.

**Document analysis**

Three sets of documents were reviewed in this study, the Heritage Act, the conservancy policy together with the national tourism policy, concerning tourism operations on communal land and the UTC constitution. These documents were reviewed to understand their goals and objectives regarding resource conservation and management in UTC. Furthermore, the policy documents were reviewed to understand the procedures of interaction, the implementation of rules, which is responsible for the distribution of benefits and how it is carried out, as well as the access to resources and the elements of participation in the conservancy. Similarly it was also done to determine local members access to resources and whether local community members participate in decision making which influence their livelihood priorities.

**Sources of information for the study**

The main sources of information for this study were the ‘internal or local’ actors in the conservancy. These include the CMC and the local conservancy community whose livelihoods are impacted by the operations of the two arrangements in their area. The tourism operators and NHC operations determine the conservation of resources and in turn influence the livelihood outcomes of conservancy members. Other sources of information included external sources outside the conservancy borders but who can influence events in UTC, such as NHC officials from the headquarters in Windhoek NGOs such as NACSO, and MET officials from the Kunene regional office and from MET headquarters in Windhoek, as they are concerned with natural resource conservation and the aspects of tourism development in communal conservancies. It was imperative to gain access to these sources in order to have a broader picture and more insight on the operations and relations of events in UTC from a sectorial spectrum.
Data analysis and interpretation

The analysis of qualitative data in this study was interpretative in nature, as it was based on examining meaningful and symbolic data. This was done to enable me to summarise what I have seen and heard which led to my understanding and interpretation of what was emerging during my fieldwork period. De vos et al., (2005) note that data collection and data analysis are tightly interwoven processes which occur interchangeably since the analysis directs the sampling of data.

In this study, a total of 24 interviews were conducted. All voice recordings were transcribed for analytical purposes. I also used open coding, by naming categorizing words and phrases used by informants as “in vivo” codes. I also used the main themes in the research questions to identify and observe whether the data from different respondents was correlating. After every interview, observational, methodological and theoretical notes were taken to direct the research process. Transcribed interviews were constantly read with the interview recordings to identify the main themes and to note for differences and similarities. Gathered data was compared to policy documents, literature and the observed information to understand the views of respondents.

In this study, the observational notes, the analysis of documents and the transcribed interviews were used as tools for the analysis of data. Triangulation and cross checking with different respondents was done to ensure coherence in the data generated and to note for major differences among respondents.
Validity and Reliability

Validity which is also interchangeably used with trustworthiness and soundness of research is of utmost important in qualitative research. Maree (2010) refer to validity as the acid test of data analysis, findings and conclusions. The terms validity and reliability in qualitative research are used to justify trustworthy, consistency, credibility, and to ensure quality in qualitative research (Golafshani, 2003). In this study, multiple data sources were used. Individual interviews, observations and policy documents and literature reports were combined to see if there was a correlation with these sources. Triangulation was also used by asking different respondents to verify information obtained and to compare it with viewpoints of other respondents. The confidentiality and anonymity of respondents was also assured during the collection of data and respondents were asked to only give their first name and no other information concerning their identity.

Limitations

Since communal conservancies are diverse in scope, demography and physiography, the case of UTC cannot be generalized to all communal conservancies in Namibia. However, a comparison of this study’s findings was made with the Tsiseb conservancy in the Erongo region and therefore provides a ground for making generalizations. It can also be generalized to other conservancies where the two arrangements are deployed and where no studies have been conducted yet.

The study also faced some limitations in the data collection process. Although the fieldwork was conducted in the second week of February, to be able to reach all key respondents after the holiday season, some key informants were still out of town (even though we arranged for interviews the previous year (end of December), and could not respond to my reminder e-mails in time as they were out of office, hence could not be interviewed. Some others were available but could also not be interviewed due to health problems.

Another limitation is that my laptop was damaged three days before data collection, and I had to postpone the data collection period. I ended up buying a new laptop which was the reason that compelled me to drop the Damara language interpreter, with the reassurance (by former researchers in UTC) that members in the conservancy are conversant in Afrikaans. However, Afrikaans proved to be a barrier to a certain extend. Even though the UTC community is conversant in Afrikaans, some members, especially the elderly could not confidently express themselves in Afrikaans as in the Damara language and this left some information unsaid.

The fact that most tourism operators recruit very few conservancy members, while others don’t have any conservancy members employed; and the fact that one tourism operator denied me access to the
population, limited the study to have a broader understanding of the relations and views shared by employed conservancy members. Non-members however, do not share the same sentiments concerning the conservation of resource and the distribution of benefits as they do not participate in the affairs of the conservancy.
CHAPTER 3

3 AN OVERVIEW ON CONSERVATION, TOURISM AND THE MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL HERITAGE IN NAMIBIA

Introduction

Chapter three provides an analysis of relations in the management of cultural and natural resources in the Uibasen Twyfelfontein Conservancy (UTC). In order to give more insight on the institutional changes which have influenced these relations, the study employed the PAA as a theoretical framework. The framework was selected owed to its strength on building upon multi actor policy network models and its ability to pay attention to institutional context, substance and power relations. The analysis is first preceded by a historical overview of events that had led to the conditions in UTC.

3.1 CBNRM, Conservancies and the management of national heritage in Namibia

Conservation during colonial time

Socio-ecological surveys conducted in rural communities in pre-colonial times, proved that rural communities had deep rooted conservation ethics, based on their religious believes, the rights of chiefs and other cultural values (MET, 1995). However, successive colonial administration throughout Africa have estranged rural people from their environments by taking away their rights through the centralize control of natural resources by the state.

‘Western’ protectionism policies, which were based on external views of conservation, ensured that large areas across the African continent being proclaimed as wildlife sanctuaries (Roe, 2008 cited by Ahebwa, 2012). In most cases, people were removed by coercion from proclaimed wildlife reserved areas, to create room for wildlife preservation (Adams, 2004; MET, 1995). The dispossessed rural people looked on for years, how the game reserves catered for the foreign tourist, who came to watch the wildlife and hunt and kill the animals, a practice which was off-limits to the rural people, since anti-hunting laws, declared wildlife either the King, or the State game.

Similar patterns of these protectionism policies of conservation were also practiced in Namibia, first by the Germans and later by the South African colonial rule. The rural people were removed from their ancestral land and were placed in homelands, known as Bantustans, to make room for the development of nature reserves. The authority and regulating mechanism that once rested with local institutions such as the chiefs were removed and the centralized control of game laws and game utilization was vested in
the central government. This turn of events, led to intense enmity between authorities and rural people, were the latter viewed the new conservation methods as ‘colonial conservation’. There was therefore little or no reason for the local community members to conserve the State game. Rural people resorted to poaching and conservation in rural areas came to mean law enforcement (MET, 1995).

Even though the colonial governments had repossessed almost all the land from rural communities in Namibia, some areas, mainly in the north and the northeastern parts of the country were left unaltered, due to the fact that they were bordering countries were animal diseases were common. There were however, noticeable anti-poaching activities in these areas, and one such area was the North western part of the country, formerly known as Kaokoveld and currently known as the Kunene region. Community participation has been practiced in Kaokoveld even before independence. The attempts of conservation in this area dates back to 1970, when the area was de-proclaimed as a game reserve by the colonial government and thus had no formal conservation status (IRDNC, 2011). Consequently, during the next decade, the area experienced an escalation of large scale illegal hunting of all species by government officials, South African military personnel, and Portuguese speaking refugees from Angola (who fled their country as a result of the civil war in 1975). Moreover, the search for ivory, rhino horns and hides, coupled with the rural people need for bush meat, contributed to a drastic decline in game in the area. The devastating drought of 1980 wiped out 85% of domestic stock, causing some game species to become extinct and game numbers were brought to their lowest levels in recorded history of Namibia (MET, 1995; IRDNC, 2011).

After the drought in 1983, a local NGO known as Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation (IRDNC), with the assistance of local chiefs, appointed the first community game guards in Kaokoveld, which marked the humble beginning of the Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) program in Namibia. Poaching in Kaokoveld had been turned around and wildlife started to increase steadily (a situation which secured development for North-West Namibia, an area which is part of the country tourism hub today). However, in other areas where the new approach had not yet been implemented, wildlife continued to disappear irrespective of the good rains (IRDNC, 2011).

With the advent of independence in 1990, the new independent Namibia was optimistic for the future. The newly formed government, through the Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and Tourism (MWCT), began to explore ways to lawfully involve rural people to manage and benefit from wildlife and tourism. However, during the early years of independence, surveys conducted by the MWCT staff in certain communal areas showed that rural people were still skeptical towards MWCT officials and regarded
them as policemen (MET, 1995). As a result government anti-poaching activities by game rangers had no support from the local people and communities even laid ambush for rangers (MET, 1995).

With independence, the time was ripe to translate a CBNRM vision based on its early achievements in the Kaokoveld, into a program that was relevant to the rest of the country. This marked the beginning of the establishment of ground breaking new conservation legislation. This was done through legally constituted local structures known as conservancies. This new mode of conservation through the CBNRM program and its conservancy model restored local ownership of resources such as wildlife and natural resources to the local communal people through legislation.

**Independence and conservation**

With independence in 1990, the new government of Namibian through its environmental agency, the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) had international obligations with regard to the conservation of ecosystem and bio-diversity. However, given the hostility that prevailed between MET officials and rural people in communal areas, the government realized that ‘colonial conservation methods’ were short term and ineffective. If Namibia was to successfully conserve wildlife and natural resources in communal areas, the needs of people living in these areas were to be addressed. Not only were people to be given direct benefits from wildlife conservation, they also needed to be re-empowered, to take responsibility for the management of wildlife and natural resources (MET, 1995).

In order to achieve this, new conservation approaches were sought, which took into account people’s needs and which can derive benefits from conservation for rural people. The successful conservation activities which was taking place in the North-West of the country (Kaokoveld) and similar projects applied in Southern Africa, such as the Communal Areas Management Program for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE) project in Zimbabwe and the Administrative Management Design Program (ADMADE) in Zambia, were used as tools for the legal institutionalization of the CBNRM program in Namibia, with the aim to extend rights of natural resources to people in communal rural areas. These activities and approaches learned within and outside the country, led to the development of an internationally well-known CBNRM program.

As a result, new laws were developed to give communal people the same rights over wildlife and tourism in communal areas, a privilege that was once only enjoyed by freehold farmers. The Wildlife Management Utilization and Tourism in Communal Areas Policy was passed in 1995, and in 1996 the Nature Conservation Amendment Act changed the Nature Conservation Ordinance of 1975, enabling
communities to form common property resource management institutions called conservancies. In 1998 the first four communal conservancies were gazetted and today, communal conservancies’ covers 52% of communal land, bringing the number of registered conservancies’ to 77 and 10 emerging (NACSO, 2013). The establishment of conservancies in Namibia is used as an important instrument for the government of Namibia to meet its goals with respect to conservation and sustainable development.

**An overview in the management of national and cultural heritage**

The origin of Namibia’s heritage legislation was intricately connected to that of South Africa. The National Monument Act of 1969 was passed in South Africa and in South-West Africa (as Namibia was formerly known). The colonial agenda of the period, influenced the declaration of many national monuments in both South Africa and Namibia, and from the onset, the management and conservation of monuments and heritage sites was connected to the bias of the South-African National Monument Commission in the conservation of historical and cultural sites (Gwasira, 2005).

With independence, the Namibian Government realized the shortcomings of the South-African National Monument Act and the Namibian authorities started compiling the National Heritage Council Bill as legislation to manage national heritage resources in the country (Gwasira, 2005). In the absence of a National Heritage Act, the South-African National Monument Act of 1969 was retained, to protect immovable cultural heritage in the country (Gwasira, 2005). In order to protect the immovable cultural heritage resources, the National Monument Council (NMC) appropriated legislative policies developed for other forms of heritage to manage its heritage resources. One such adopted policy was the MET Policy on the establishment of conservancies and the Policy on wildlife management, utilization and tourism development in communal areas (also known as the Communal Conservancy Policy). The communal Conservancy Policy was developed based on the assumptions that the natural heritage resources can be used in a sustainable manner by local members themselves. This entailed that the power to manage heritage at the community level was devolved to the local community, with the community viewing the heritage product as its own, and assuming the responsibility for its conservation (Gwasira, 2002). The policy was thus effective in addressing the local people alienation from their heritage resource. The National Monument Council therefore usurped the MET policy to help in managing the country’s immovable cultural and natural heritage.

After the appropriation of the MET policy, the NMC was still experiencing problems with the effective management of national sites, mainly due to the vast distances between the sites and its headquarters
in Windhoek the capital city, and the fact that they were greatly understaffed (Gwasira, 2005). Due to these difficulties, critical activities such as regular inspection, or routine monitoring could not be accomplished without resorting to the communal conservancy policy. As a result, the arrangement was those cultural heritages which was situated within conservancy boundaries, were temporarily given as a responsibility of the conservancy community to manage, conserve and to report any violation of it to NMC, who was responsible for the enforcement of the law (Gwasira, 2002).

MET therefore became the major stakeholder of all Namibia’s cultural and natural heritage sites under the NMC, while the legislation for protection was the National Monument Act of 1969. The NMC found itself in the role of a coordinator rather than a policy implementer. One can therefore say that, prior to the implementation of the National Heritage Act of 2004, the immovable and cultural heritage sites and resources was managed by ‘borrowed laws’ mainly from MET, while the day to day monitoring was done by the local conservancy communities (Gwasira, 2002).

**The situation in Uibasen Twyfelfontein Conservancy**

In Twyfelfontein the situation was slightly different from the above. Twyfelfontein is situated in the north western part of Namibia, one of the areas where conservation started in the early 1980s. Conservation and tourism development in Twyfelfontein started before independence and before the establishment of conservancies. Field work data revealed that Mr. Elias Xoagub, a local communal farmer, started farming on the farm Twyfelfontein in the early 1970s after the area was allocated as a homeland to the Damara people, according to the colonial Odendaal Commission. Even though the Twyfelfontein rock engravings were proclaimed as a National site in the early 1950s, the South-African National Monument Council did nothing in terms of managing the site, and the preservation of the site was left to the mercy of commercial farmers who used to farm in the area before it became communal land. When Mr. Elias started farming in the area, he was positioned in the area were the rock engravings are situated and by seeing the potential of the rock art, he continued preserving and managing the site. He later opened a campsite and started charging a small fee to tourist who visited the area, to see the rock engravings.

“From history .... when (Elias Xoagub) came into the area... tourists used to come in but there was nobody monitoring or cleaning or you know trying to preserve the site. So over the years Elias came in and started to manage the place. He then started charging money for people coming there. Some funds
he used to set up structures, just places where the guides could sit, so he was actually the person managing the place”. (NGO member, research interview).

With independence, the Twyfelfontein National Heritage Site, together with other cultural heritage resources, was placed under the management of MET but was still under the jurisdiction of the National Monument Council (NMC). With the declaration of the area as the Uibasen Twyfelfontein Conservancy (UTC) in December 1999, the conservancy was granted partial rights by MET to manage wild life and natural resources, including the Twyfelfontein National Heritage Site, on behalf of the government. Mr. Elias happened to become the first chairperson of the conservancy and he continued to manage the Twyfelfontein National Heritage Site together with the wildlife and natural resources in the conservancy on behalf of the government.

In 2004 the National Heritage Act of 2004 was implemented and the management of all National heritage sites including the Twyfelfontein National heritage site was re-entrusted to the National Heritage Council (NHC), which replaced the NMC.

“At first it was an individual who was managing Twyfelfontein ... with permission from the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. The conservancy was later gazetted and then a body within the conservancy started to look after the resources and then the National Heritage Act came in force, replacing the National Monuments Act, and that is how the management of the site was passed on to us.” (NHC official, research interview).

With the area being declared as a conservancy, the elected conservancy management was tasked to draw up a conservancy management plan and a benefit distribution plan. However, due to the small size of the conservancy and the semi-arid condition of the area, agricultural production was not a feasible option for development. Nonetheless, the comparative advantages of the conservancy include the rock engravings, the presence of wild life, especially the free roaming desert elephants and the scenic beauty of red sandstone formation. Given these conditions, the UTC community decided to use non-consumptive methods of wild life as a conservation mechanism and tourism was regarded as a viable option to conserve natural resources, with the benefits that accrue from tourism as incentive to improve people livelihoods in the conservancy. These favorable conditions have attracted various actors to the UTC, to tap from these resources, on condition that they adhere to MET’s policy concerning sustainable usage of natural resources and the enhancement of the conservancy members’ livelihoods.
Box 3.1: Facts on the Uibasen Twyfelfontein Conservancy (UTC)

- 1999 Registered as a communal conservancy
- 286km\(^2\) ground area
- 300 Approximate population in conservancy
- 196 Registered conservancy members
- Twyfelfontein National Heritage site, gain UNESCO status in 2007
- Conservancy consist of 5 tourism interventions:
  1. A country lodge
  2. 2 eco lodges
  3. A mountain camp
  4. 3 campsites and
  5. A living museum

3.2 The management of cultural and natural resources in UTC

This section analyzes two policy arrangements, employed over the same area and community. The Communal Conservancy Policy of 1995 and the National Heritage Act of 2004 are two laws, both concerned with the conservation and the sustainable management of resources, employed over the UTC. Even though both set of rules are sharing a common standpoint of conservation and sustainability, their mandates in achieving these objectives differ.

In order to understand these arrangements, the study will first identify the different actors that are involved and influenced by these two arrangements. Secondly, the study will present and analyze each policy arrangement by looking at the rules of the game, actors involved, the power relations among actors and the discourses that exist around these arrangements. The section will then explain the implications of the employment of these two policy arrangements on the UTC community, before the section is concluded.

Actors in UTC

As seen from a policy arrangement approach, actors are people or organizations involved or excluded, in the formation and implementation of a policy arrangement and are the ones who greatly benefit or bear
the cost from such an arrangement (Buizer, 2008). Actor coalitions on the other hand, are groups of actors who are having similar viewpoints and interest in the policy and usually join with other actors to achieve the same goals (Wiering & Immink, 2006). Actors and their coalitions are therefore the identified players who exercise influence on the policy domain. They determine who is involved in the policy under consideration, which power relations exist between them and they also determine the institutional context in which they operate (Arts & Tatenhove, 2004; Liefferink, 2006, see also Tatenhove et al., 2000).

UTC is characterized by a number of actors and a multiplicity of stakeholders. Actors on the governmental level in UTC comprise of MET, the Ministry of Land and Resettlement, and the Ministry of Youth and Sport. On the donor level, actors comprise of (i) NGOs such as UNESCO, Namibia Nature Foundation (NNF), and supporting organizations such as Namibia Association for CBNRM Support Organization (NACSO). On the local level the actors are, the Conservancy Committee Members (CMC), conservancy members, the Traditional Authority (TA) and local and private tourism operators. The National Heritage Council (NHC) which has replaced the National Monument Council (NMC) is seen as the new local actor in the conservancy, new in the sense that its operations under the former NMC was different from its current operations. Even though conservation and sustainable utilization of resources are the main tenets that brought these different actors together, each has its own underlying interest, under the pretext of conservation.
Table 3.1 actors in UTC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State: MET</td>
<td>One of the main actors in UTC, and responsible for the management of wildlife, natural resources and tourism development in the conservancy. Determines the setting and approval of wildlife quotas, as well as providing capacity building to conservancy members with the assistance from civil and private organizations. Ensures that the UTC remains compliant with legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of youth and sport</td>
<td>Line ministry under which the NHC affiliates. Provide a budget to NHC activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of lands and rehabilitation</td>
<td>Responsible for land tenure rights in the country and oversee the regional land boards and TA’s concerning land issues on communal land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Heritage Council</td>
<td>It is responsible for the entire management of all national monuments and cultural sites in the country, including the Twyfelfontein World Heritage Site (TWHS) in UTC. Responsible for identifying places of cultural importance to be enlisted as national monuments, and for the preservation of such sites for future generations e.g. the Burn mountains and Organ pipes in UTC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservancy Management Committee (CMC)</td>
<td>The UTC is governed through an elected committee system of 7 people. The CMC is the executive body of the UTC and is responsible for the conservation and management of natural resources, the sustainable management and utilization of wildlife and the distribution of benefits, to conservancy members. The CMC is also responsible to acquire, hold and manage the property rights and assets of the conservancy, being it land, buildings, money or any tangible and intangible assets, on behalf and for the benefit of the members. The CMC also negotiates with donors and investors and liaise with internal and external institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Traditional authority (TA)</td>
<td>The Traditional authority represents the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement, as the overseer of land in communal areas through the regional land boards. The TA is responsible for advising the CMC on land issues, while businesses on community land are allocated to entrepreneurs in consultation with the TA. TA also mediate in disputes, especially those pertaining to land issues in the conservancy as well as arbitrate between minor civil problems brought to them by community members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservancy</td>
<td>Conservancy members are people who are born or married into the UTC, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members</td>
<td>years and above and registered with the UTC office. Members have the right to vote, and they are also eligible for benefits in the conservancy. Members are responsible for the conservation of wildlife and natural resources in the conservancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I)NGOs UNESCO</td>
<td>UNESCO ensures that the outstanding universal value of TWHS as a cultural site is maintained, and the integrity of the property is intact according to world standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACSO</td>
<td>NACSO is a supporting organization for communal conservancies and is mainly overseeing the management of natural resources and assists the conservancy with issues pertaining to governance and human wildlife conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNF</td>
<td>Assist the conservancy members with technical matters such as financial management, empowerment and capacity building through training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Tourism operators</td>
<td>They are conservancy members, also known as the ‘UTC pioneers’ and own tourism enterprises and portions of land in the conservancy. They are responsible to manage their enterprises in accordance with the communal conservancy policy and share tourism benefits with the conservancy members, by contributing towards the conservancy fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private tourism operators</td>
<td>They are the tourism investors in UTC. Their main responsibility is to assist with the conservation of natural resources and wildlife through tourism. To empower the local conservancy members with training and knowledge in tourism related aspects and share revenues derived from tourism as benefits to the conservancy members, as per existing agreement with the CMC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 THE NHC as a policy arrangement in UTC
There is a number of national sites found on communal land in Namibia. As previously discussed, national and cultural resources were formerly managed by communal communities, due to the poor capacitated NMC. These sites were managed with ‘borrowed laws’ from MET, mainly the communal conservancy policy (Gwasira 2005). Although the South-African National Monument Act of 1969 was still used to protect National Monuments in the country after independence, the Heritage Act of 2004 was eventually implemented to substitute the Act of 1969. The new Act enabled the NHC to replace the NMC and the NHC became the organizational institution responsible for the management of national monuments sites and cultural resources in the country.
The Heritage Act has empowered the NHC to identify and acquire places and objects of heritage significance to be conserved and managed by the NHC. Henceforth, all national monuments, or heritage sites located on communal land are placed under the management of NHC. Whenever these sites are located on conservancy land, the area where the heritage resource is situated is sectioned off by a buffer zone and is placed under the management of NHC. In UTC, the TWHS is located on an area of 57 hectares and an extended buffer zone of 9,194 hectares around the heritage site, which delineate the heritage site from the conservancy land (http://whc.unesco.org). The Heritage Act is the legislation that regulates the operations of NHC in UTC. Even so, it should be adhered to by all actors in the conservancy, as it influences their operations.

Box 3.2: Some functions of the NHC

| (a) To identify, conserve, protect and manage places and objects of heritage significance; |
| (b) To initiate measures for or with respect to participation |
| (i) The conservation of |
| (ii) The provision of access to places or objects of heritage significance |
| (c) To promote public understanding of Namibia's heritage and develop and conduct community information and education programs; |
| (d) To liaise with other bodies responsible for or engaged in activities, relating to the protection, conservation, management and promotion of Namibia's heritage. |

Source: The National Heritage Act no 27 of 2004

**NHC rules and resources**

With the passing of the National Heritage Act in 2004, the NHC was empowered to regain its mandate over all National Monuments in Namibia. Meaning, the regulation of the Twyfelfontein National Heritage site was no longer under the conservancy management. The appropriation of the new rule has negatively impacted upon UTC members, mainly because the heritage site is regarded as the main asset of the conservancy. The implementation of the new arrangement was therefore accompanied by tension among actors in the conservancy. The operations of NHC in UTC have changed the formal and informal rules regarding the management of TWHS. It influenced the level of participation of the community members, and the distribution of benefits. These amendments have in turn, changed the cultural and political environment in the conservancy.
3.4 The Communal Conservancy Policy as a policy arrangement in UTC

The Wildlife Management, Utilization and Tourism in Communal Areas Policy, or the communal conservancy policy as it is generally known, came into effect in 1995 after it was approved as a new conservation policy by the Namibian government. The aim of the policy was to extend rights of ownership of wildlife and natural resources to rural people in communal areas, through the establishment of institutions known as conservancies. In 1996 the Nature Conservation Amendment Act of 1996 was passed as legislation that placed the communal conservancy policy in effect and enabled MET to register conservancies.

For rural communities to gain these user rights, they needed to form or establish institutions known as conservancies. Conservancies are legally constituted institutions, with clearly defined boundaries accepted by neighboring communities and consisting of elected representatives who oversee the management of the conservancy, according to the conservancy’s constitution on behalf of its members (MET, 1995; NACSO, 2010). Beside the user rights to resources, the policy also gave conservancies the opportunity to venture into tourism development, either by themselves or in partnership with professional tourism organizations on state land.
Box 3.3: The main objectives of the Nature Conservation Amendment Act of 1996

1. To establish the management and utilization of wildlife and other renewable living resources on communal land so that rural communities can:
   a) Participate on a partnership basis with MET and other Ministries in the management of, and benefits from resources,
   b) Benefit from rural development based on wildlife, tourism and other natural resource management;
   c) Improve the conservation of natural resources by wise and sustainable resources management and the protection of biodiversity.
2. To redress past discriminatory policies and practices which gave substantial rights over wildlife to commercial farmers, but which ignored communal farmers.
3. To allow rural communities on state land, to undertake tourism ventures, and to enter into co-operative agreements with commercial tourism organizations to develop tourism activities on state land in communal areas.

Source: MET 1995

The tripartite approach of the conservancy model is aimed at achieving: 1) the conservation and sustainable utilization of natural resources through shared decision-making. 2) To create incentives for resource conservation through benefits that accrue from resource management. 3) To link with rural development through tourism development on state land. The policy stipulates clearly how these objectives should be achieved, with directives such as community participation in decision making, the equitable distribution of resources which accrue from tourism development and access to resources in the conservancy. These directives were further strengthened by the National Tourism Policy of 2008.

After various mobilization activities (workshops and meetings) by MET with the assistance of various civil organizations, the Uibasen Twyfelfontein community embraced the new conservation concept and in December 1999, the area became a legally recognized conservancy known as the Uibasen Twyfelfontein Conservancy (UTC).
Box 3.4: The objectives of the National Tourism Policy of 2008.

3. Tourism Development on Communal Land

3.3.1 Government encourages the establishment of tourism on communal land as an efficient means of involving communities in the tourism sector and thus for them to share in the benefits derived from tourism.

3.3.2 Government recognises that tourism offers significant opportunities for poverty alleviation in communal land areas. Due to barriers that blocks tourism investment, Government will institute measures to ensure access to resources in order to ensure that the full potential for tourism development is realised.

3.3.3 The core function of conservancies is community-based natural resource management. Revenues derived from natural resource management will be critical in ensuring local support for conservation and covering direct costs involved. Conservancies should only engage in activities that do not compromise the integrity of natural resources.

3.3.4 Where conservancies exist, they should be the primary agency for the collection and distribution of benefits from tourism use of natural resources. MET through the Community Based Natural Resources Management programme will facilitate appropriate training for members of the conservancies to undertake tasks associated with their operation.

3.3.5 Conservancies will be empowered to negotiate sub-leases as long as the new agreements comply with the terms of the original lease to the conservancy.

3.3.6 Synergy between tourism on communal land and adjoining state-protected areas will be encouraged.

3.3.7 Local communities often incur considerable costs through damage to crops and the living environment, as well as through surrendering traditional hunting rights or refraining from killing disruptive animals. They must therefore benefit directly from local tourism revenue for such restraint and loss of livelihood as per existing agreement with the conservancies.

Source: MET National Tourism Policy 2008

The Conservancy Policy, rules and resources

The first organizational dimension which influences change is ‘the rules of the game’. Wiering & Arts (2006) refer to rules as the current operations within a policy domain, and include formal and informal procedures of decision making and interactions. The Nature Conservation Ordinance Act of 1996 and
the Wildlife Management, Utilization and Tourism in Communal Areas Policy of 1995 are the central
guidelines, or the formal, fixed and binding rules exercised in UTC. These rules have shaped the
boundaries of UTC as a policy domain and stipulate what is expected from each player in the
conservancy (Arts et al., 2005). The communal conservancy policy thus, regulates the operations of all
actors in the conservancy. The rules of the policy include aspects such as access to resources,
participation and the equitable distribution of benefits. These rules have produced change, which have
influenced relations among actors in the conservancy, as illustrated in the cases below.

**Relations between the conservancy management committee members, and the private and local
tourism operators in UTC**

Besides the conservancy policy being the dominant rule in UTC, tourism operators are also subjected to
the National Tourism Policy of 2008, which also compliments the Communal Policy. Even though the
ideals and objectives of these legislations seems to be clear and well understood by actors, their
implementation in UTC is challenged by elements based on power such as money, influence and
knowledge, among the different players in the conservancy.

Resources and power are inextricably linked to each other, as the distribution of resources is dependent
or linked to the power relations that exist between players. Resources are therefore not equally
distributed among actors, as elements of power come to play and influence the distribution of resource,
which in turn can influence relations. Power in UTC is used in two ways to solicit resources: as a
mobilizing tool and as an institutional tool.

With the devolution of partial rights to UTC, the state invested power into the conservancy community
to manage resources found in UTC. The power given to the UTC community is a mobilization tool to
conserve resources on behalf of the government. In order to understand the dimension of power and
resources in UTC, this study was aimed at understanding who owns resources and how they are utilized
to achieve livelihood impacts of UTC members.

The ownership of land as a resource is a complex issue in UTC. Even though communal land in Namibia
belongs to the state, not all the land in UTC belongs to the state. Prior to the establishment of UTC,
some individuals owned land which they acquired through the customary law system and were involved
in small scale tourism activities. When MET was mobilizing the Twyfelfontein community to form a
conservancy, some knowledgeable individuals, who later came to be known as the ‘UTC pioneers’, used
the establishment of the conservancy as an institutional tool and applied for Permission To Occupy land
(PTO) from the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement, with the aim to either expand their tourism business or lease their portions of land to potential tourism investors, once the area becomes a conservancy.

With the proclamation of the area as a conservancy in December 1999, MET and the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement through its Communal Land Reform Act of 2002 and the Traditional Authority Act of 2000 passed legislation, which requested that all PTO’s to be converted into leaseholds and be transferred into the conservancy’s name. This was done firstly, because the land in communal areas belongs to the state and conservancies are established for the common use of resources on such land.

Secondly, it was the mobilizing tool for conservancy members to receive partial ownership of land for the conservation of wild life and resources in order for members to see conservation as an asset from which they can benefit and not a liability. However, it so happened that the ‘UTC pioneers’ became part of the committee members of the newly established UTC and they occupied the highest leadership positions in the management committee. Given their position of influence, and the fact that the transfer of PTOs in the conservancy’s name might affect their interest, they were reluctant to transfer all PTOs to leaseholds as requested by MET and the Ministry of Land and Rehabilitation, during their time of office.

“….. Elias Xoagub has his two leaseholds with Mowani Mountain Camp and Aba Huab, and they don’t pay benefits to the community…they just don’t want to hand over the leasehold to the conservancy.

(Conservancy member, research interviews).

As a result, all PTO’s were not transferred into the conservancy’s name and until date, some leasehold are still in the possession of the UTC pioneers. This entails that private tourism operators such as Mowani Mountain Camp and Abba-Huab campsite are paying their conservancy levies to the owners of the leaseholds and not to the conservancy office, something which is in contravention with the communal conservancy policy.

Owed to their position of influence in the community, the ‘UTC pioneers’ have gone unchallenged for the past decade. It is more than a decade since the establishment of UTC and the issue of leaseholds is still contested and negotiated by the different conservancy management members, who took office over the years and in the process, conservancy members are continually denied the benefits that is formally due to them.
The private tourism operators, who operate on the leaseholds that belong to individuals, deny conservancy members accesses to benefits, by using the loopholes concerning the land issue in UTC. Given their knowledge concerning policy procedures, they claim that they are not doing anything wrong and are acting according to the law, by paying the conservancy levy to the owner of the leasehold. This situation has placed the conservancy committee in a very uncomfortable situation in representing its members regarding the distribution of benefits.

“We pay the owner of the leasehold, that’s according to the law” (Mowani manager, research interview)

Another grievance concerning access is that some private tourism operators restrict the free movement of people in the conservancy. Free entrance to Mowani Mountain Camp and Kipwe camp is not guaranteed. Visitors to these tourism enterprises are required to explain the purposes of their visit before entrance is allowed. This kind of operation is intimidating in an independent Namibia, and the conservancy members are annoyed by this situation and they feel that they are treated like intruders on their own land. This is however, only practiced by the above-mentioned operators, while with other operators, the right to entry is reserved to everybody. These conditions have taint relations and weakened the communication channels between some tourism operators, and the CMC.

**Relations between the Conservancy Management Committee, the Traditional Authority and the local conservancy members**

The UTC Constitution, which is entirely based on the Nature Conservation Amendment Act of 1996, is the legal binding document that governs the CMC and the general conservancy members. The Annual General Meeting (AGM) which is regarded as the highest decision making body in the conservancy, is held once a year. It is through the AGM that conservancy members exercise their right to vote their representatives in, or out of office.

There is however, a difference between conservancy members and the conservancy community in UTC. Conservancy members are people who are born or married into the UTC, who are 18 years and above and are registered with the UTC office. Members have the right to vote, and are eligible for benefits in the conservancy. The conservancy community on the other hand, comprise of people who resides in the conservancy, either due to employment commitments or in search of employment opportunities. Members who are born in the conservancy and of voting age, but who are not registered with the UTC office, out of their own free will, resort under the community, as membership in conservancies is a free choice, and membership in UTC is by birth or through matrimony to a conservancy member.
Fieldwork data revealed that there are generally good relations between the CMC and the conservancy members. These relations can be attributed to the equitable distribution of benefits by the CMC to individuals and vulnerable members of UTC. The conservancy members are also well aware of the cooperating and non-cooperating tourism investors in the conservancy, an indication that information concerning issues and problems in the conservancy flows from the management members to the rest of the conservancy members.

However, besides the flow of information from the CMC to the general conservancy members, noticeable knowledge gaps where identified with some CMC. Based on observations, the CMC was not speaking with one voice. Some committee members are more conversant with information than others and this shortcoming can have adverse consequences to the recipients. The fact that the information from the conservancy management is not congruent, can lead to distorted information filtering to the rest of the conservancy members. It was startling to note that some newly elected CMC members, have never visited the Heritage site and some tourism enterprises in the conservancy, even though they were elected in their positions for the past eleven months and reside in the conservancy. The UTC constitution stipulates that new committee members should undertake an orientation within the first six months in office (UTC Constitution article 15). These deficiencies can contribute to knowledge gaps and the misinterpretation of information to the general members of the conservancy.

“The people in the committee some understand certain things but others they don’t understand and that is a problem” (conservancy member, research interview)

Nevertheless, besides the good relations, conservancy members are complaining that the CMC is taking too long to implement the planned development programs. This can be attributed to the fact that the conservancy management is constantly undergoing change. New office bearers are not serving long enough to bring about change, as the term of office for CMC is only five years, and the management committees can be ousted, before the end of the five year term, if discrepancies are observed about them by conservancy members. This situation might slow down the progress of CMC, when action is to be taken concerning planned development programs and can contribute to members becoming impatient with the slow pace of development in the conservancy.

Another problem which influences relations in UTC is culture. The representation of UTC members by the #Ao-Daman Traditional Authority, or Ward 7 as it is locally known, embeds underlying cultural differences. The Twyfelfontein Uibasen community appears as a homogeneous group of people to
outsiders. However, this community is not as homogeneous as it seems. The Damara tribe is the predominant tribe in UTC and the surrounding area. However, the Damara tribe is divided into 11 clans who are widely distributed over the country but who share the same language culture and history. The Damaras in UTC comprise of the Daureb Daman who originally hails from the nearby Erongo region and the #Ao-Daman who are predominantly from the Kunene region, under whose jurisdiction the Twyfelfontein Uibasen community resort. Damara speaking people who are from the Daureb Daman TA, but who are members of the UTC can tacitly undermine the representation of the #Ao-Daman TA. The feeling of not being well represented can cause lack of cooperation and participation among some members of the community in issues communicated to them by the #Ao-Daman TA.

“The majority of the people are not from this Traditional Authority, even though they are Damaras, most of them belongs to the Daureb Daman Traditional Authority……they are against the fact that we the TA should be given benefits. Sometimes if they know the chief is from which political party and the conservancy chairperson is from which party than there is a pulling and people are not in agreement”

(TA, research interview)

The fact that the Damara people share the same culture, history and language wherever they are found in the country, can be considered as an advantage, but the representation of a different TA over a given group of people can jeopardize this advantage. Another positive attribute about the Damara tribe is that the majority of the Damara people in the country belong to the same political party, the United Democratic Front (UDF). Although, some Damara people are affiliated to the ruling South-West Africa People Organization (SWAPO) party, or other political parties in the country, most Damara TA’s belongs to the UDF. This allegiance can guarantee cooperation from members and can secure positive relations in the community. One can thus conclude that underlying cultural and political differences contains hidden powers that silently held sway and which can positively or adversely affect the agenda of representation and participation in UTC. Culture and politics are some of the elements or aspects that need to be considered and kept in mind when policies and rules are implemented over a given area and community, as they can influence the levels of participation and access to resources.

**Actors and their coalitions in UTC**

It was interesting to note 3 actor coalitions in the conservancy. The first coalition is The Joint Venture Meetings (JVM) and consists of the CMC, TA and the Twyfelfontein Country Lodge (TCL). The second coalition comprises of the TA, CMC and the local conservancy members, which I called the ‘Local
coalition.’ While the third coalition is known as the Joint Management Meetings (JMM) which comprise of all actors in the conservancy, but which is contested by actors within the coalition itself, it consist of the tourism operators, CMC, TA and the NHC.

Starting with the JVM, given the mutual understanding that exists between the CMC, TA and TCL, the trio formed the Joint Venture Meetings (JVM). The TCL was the first tourism operator to invest in the conservancy and the only tourism operator that has a joint venture partnership with the UTC. The trio shares a history and has started together a decade and a half ago, hence sharing a common view regarding the wellbeing of the conservancy, its people and the resources. These meetings are held on a regular basis and are aimed at identifying issues or problems that are of concern to the actors and strive to seek amicable solutions collectively. The JVM currently does include neither the private or local tourism operators nor the NHC, but would like to include all actors in the conservancy. This is an indication that when actors are sharing a common goal, relations are strengthened, communication channels are open, rules and procedures are understood, and an atmosphere of trust and cooperation is established. This was echoed by all interviewed conservancy members:

“Our relationship is the strongest with the TCL” (CMC, research interview)

The second coalition is the ‘local coalition’. This coalition opposes the NHC, mainly on the basis of participation, access to resources and the distribution of benefits. The local coalition is of the opinion that they were treated indifferently by the NHC with the implementation of the Heritage Act, even though they were responsible for the management of the national site on behalf of the NMC (now the NHC). Secondly, they failed to understand that even though the demarcated buffer zone of the Twyfelfontein World Heritage Site (TWHS) is within the conservancy boundary line, they are excluded and are not recognized as the custodian of the land on which the TWHS is situated. Thirdly, they argue that, the fact that the NHC is having exclusive management rights over the heritage site makes them feel excluded and denied access and participation in decision making from the resource that they were protecting for years. Finally, the local coalition argue that the NHC is not giving any benefits to the conservancy, nor assisting with local development, even-though they are generating revenues at the site which is on ‘their’ conservancy land, which has, and still is conserved with the assistance of the local conservancy members.

“ The heritage is giving nothing to the conservancy.” (Conservancy member, research interview).
The NHC on the other hand is of the opinion that they are entrusted with the responsibility for managing the heritage site on behalf of the state and they represent the state on a national level. Concerning the issue of benefits, the NHC claims that they pay individuals for services rendered and do not distribute benefits to communities. Hence, revenues which are generated at TWHS will benefit the entire country. This was also noted with the access to resources. The NHC claim that they recruit conservancy members as guides and as employees and revenues that is paid to these members will trickle down to the rest of the conservancy members.

“The NHC employed conservancy members and guides, the salary and the percentages that is offered to them will cater for themselves as well as 4 or 5 members of their families and their families are part of the conservancy community” (NHC official, research interviews).

However, the conservancy members reasoned that not all the guides or peopled employed by NHC belongs to the conservancy and some revenues are therefore leaking out of the conservancy, and will not trickle down to the rest of the conservancy members.

The informal rules between the local coalition and the NHC also seem to be challenging. Fieldwork data revealed that the conservancy management undertook an agreement with the NHC concerning revenue sharing. The internal arrangement was that NHC would employ some members from the community and pay 5% of their revenues to the conservancy fund for assisting in the conservation of the site. However, in the early years of the operation of the conservancy, the former conservancy management decided that the 5% is given to the guides since their guiding fees were very little, and the conservancy members were much fewer than (only 65 members compared to 196 today). Currently the conservancy is of the opinion that NHC is making a lot of money from the entrance and guiding fees, especially with the new status of the heritage site. The conservancy management is of the opinion that the 40/60 share (40% for guides and 60% for the NHC) is a lot of money and the NHC should give the 5% back to the conservancy fund. This informal rule, concerning benefit sharing, was done before the implementation of the act, and with the implementation of the Heritage Act, revenue sharing with the local community was not included in the act, and the reason given is that TWHS is a national asset.

“Our approach is service based, those who are rendering a service can get something, but others can’t just get something from doing nothing, or just because they are living there… and the work that NHC is doing is for the nation” (NHC official, research interview).
Finally, the Joint Management Meeting (JMM) is the third actor coalition in the conservancy. In order to form institutional links with different actors in the conservancy, the NHC initiated the JMM. These meetings are called and chaired by NHC and serve as a platform where different actors in the conservancy converge, to tackle issues which are of concern in the conservancy, in order to find solutions collectively. However, the TA argues that the newly formed JMM is not really addressing issues which concern the community. They claim that these meetings are not held on planned regular intervals as initiated (quarterly), but are only called when the NHC is having problems. The TA is of the opinion that they are only called to solve problems for the NHC and they feel that they are used in these meetings.

“We the TA and the conservancy are only used when the NHC is having problems with its business or with the guides, that’s when we have meetings, but if there is no problems between them than there are no meetings.” (TA member, research interview)

Even though the private tourism operators also claim to have a formal relationship with the NHC, they are however, not affected in any way by the operations of the NHC. Their guest are having access to the TWHS and upon their arrival at the site, their guest are entrusted in the capable hands of the NHC guides. Tourism operators are sharing a common goal with the NHC which is tourism and share the same clientele and resource. The tourism operators and NHC are therefore sharing the same viewpoint when it comes to tourism and the preservation of the heritage site, hence using the arrangement to obtain their respective goals.

The NHC appear to be a ‘stand-alone’ actor as a result of the tension brought by the Heritage Act arrangement, which is exacerbated by poor relations and the lack of interactive communication among actors in the conservancy. The power relations among actors and actor coalitions differ in the conservancy. This mean that even though the two arrangements are fundamentally externally congruent, meaning that both arrangements advocates for the wider sustainable conservation of natural resources, they are internally incoherent, as the process in which the conservation and preservation of TWHS is managed, is plagued by the power differences that exist among actors involved. Nonetheless, the NHC remain the dominant actor when access to the most sought after resource in the conservancy is concerned. Tourism operators in the conservancy and those in the Kunene region depends on TWHS as the draw card for tourism, while the UTC members depend on these operations for their livelihoods.
It was also interesting to note that the UTC pioneers, were very instrumental in using the conservancy as an institutional organization to mobilize resources from regional government to the conservancy. Given their influence in the conservancy and in the region, they managed to convince the regional government to build ablution facilities for conservancy members and to extend resources such as electricity and to build a network tower, closer to one of the most populated villages in the conservancy (rather than the original positions were these resources where envisaged). Access to these resources have changed the community lives and have impacted on the livelihoods of the UTC community as elaborated in chapter 4.

One can conclude that the state has devolved power to conservancy members, as a mobilization resource to attain the development-conservation nexus for UTC. However, on local level some actors used the conservancy as an institutional tool to mainly extend their own interest in the name of conservation. The degree of power actors possess in UTC, determine and influence the distribution of resources among players in the conservancy. The CMC is the weaker regulator in the conservancy compared to actors such as the UTC pioneers and NHC, who are wielding more power and can therefore, deny conservancy members benefits and access to resources.
3.5 The reflection on discourses in UTC

Relations in UTC are reflected in discourses. As operationalized in chapter 2, discourses in UTC, are based on the problems caused by the implementation of two policy arrangements in the conservancy, and their implications on the livelihood priorities of the conservancy community. At first commonly shared discourses are observed, followed by discourses at a higher level of abstraction which are based on the two arrangements in the conservancy. Discourses based on the two arrangements include those aspects that are enshrined in the policy documents and which include concepts such as access to resources, the distribution of benefits and participation. The aim was to understand the objectives of the arrangements and their effects on the UTC community and to determine whether or not, the arrangements had met their intended outcomes.
Commonly shared discourses

In Namibia, concepts such as benefit sharing, sustainable natural resource management, and conservation are some concepts that portray a neo liberal desirable language, not just towards rural communities who were treated unequally by the previous colonial regimes, but they are also desirable words to local rural communities who experience the potential benefits brought by the establishment of conservancies, and to some tourist who visits communal conservancies in Namibia. Conservancies in Namibia are generally heralded as a desirable discourse in tourism literature (Manyara & Jones, 2007; Goodwin & Spencely, 2007; Ashley, 2001). The enactment of the UTC is perceived as an important instrument for the conservation and the sustainable usage of natural resources and wildlife which is one of the main objectives of the conservancy policy arrangement.

Although the conservancy is characterized by some conflicting discourses, there are some general local discourses that are observed by all actors in the conservancy. Based on fieldwork data and observations, the main aim of the conservancy, which is the conservation and the sustainable usage of resources, seems to be well understood by all stakeholders in UTC, even though actors use them for their own benefits.

One local conservation discourse that surfaced in all discussions was the cleaning up campaigns. This was one general discourse that was expressed in one accord by all respondents in the conservancy. The cleaning up campaigns that often takes place in the conservancy, are sometimes spearheaded by the unemployed youth members. During these campaigns, different actors assist members by contributing in cash or in kind for cleaning the conservancy. The cleaning up campaigns is one activity where all actors are in unison in UTC.

“When we are having the cleaning up campaigns the lodges and NHC are assisting the campaigns. The Country lodge gives the black plastic bags for the collection of refuse and also provides lunch and Mowani camp, assist in transporting the refuse to the big duming site.” (Conservancy member, research interview)

Another local sustainable conservation discourse observed, is that of the non-consumptive utilization of wildlife. The non-consumptive utilization of wildlife is enshrined in the UTC constitution and is acknowledged by MET quota setting board. The adherence to this rule by all stakeholders could be observed by the number of wildlife populations in the conservancy. The fact that the animals are used to the presence of people is an indication that the animals don’t see humans as a threat.
“Due to the small size of the conservancy we don’t hunt, our constitution doesn’t allow hunting and we preserve the animals for tourism purposes”. (Conservancy member, research interview)

Other general discourses on local level, include the ‘good relations’ between the conservancy members and the operators in the conservancy. All operators claimed to have ‘good relations’ with each other and with the CMC and its members. However, these sentiments were not shared by most conservancy members. Conservancy members are well aware of private tourism operators who are cooperating with the conservancy office and adhering to the conservancy policy and those who don’t. Those who do not cooperate with the CMC don’t seem to have very good relations with the conservancy members. The conservancy members were also contesting the ‘good relations’ that exist between them and NHC. The conservancy members do not fully understand the operations of the NHC and the misunderstanding regarding the operations and management of TWHS still prevails, a decade after the NHC has established its presence in UTC. The lack of mutual understanding and low levels of communication with the NHC was not just experienced by conservancy members but was also noted by tourism operators in the conservancy.

“It’s quite important to be well informed of changes or things that are happening at the heritage site, because that’s the main attraction for us but we don’t have proper communication with the heritage” (Private tourism operator, research interview)

These discrepancies in communication surfaced in conversations with conservancy members and tourism operators, but where good relations prevail, positive discourses transpired as well. There is a particular strong positive discourse between the Twyfelfontein country lodge, the conservancy office and the general conservancy members. Due to the mutual understanding that exists between the Twyfelfontein country lodge and the conservancy, a good working relationship exists.

“We are having very good relations with the Twyfelfontein Lodge, even the community knows that” (Conservancy member, research interview)

This sentiment was unfortunately not shared concerning other tourism operators in the conservancy, or at least not in the same degree. With some operators, it was the exact opposite of the above statement while with others; there are moderate communications and relations.
There is a general absence of effective institutional linkages in UTC, which is characterized by poor communication and information flow among stakeholders in the conservancy. Actor’s participation in NHC affairs is absent and relations remain problematic in UTC.

These are some of the general discourses which are commonly shared and which are observed in UTC.

**Official discourses: The conservancy arrangement**

Conflicting discourses are contradicting the official discourses concerning ownership of resources and benefit sharing, which in turn have influenced relations in the conservancy.

The benefit sharing discourse is highly debated and contested by conservancy members. Although benefit sharing is a formal discourse which is identified as a means of livelihood enhancement and the empowerment of rural communities, this objective is not fully implemented and accomplished in UTC.

The distribution of benefits to conservancy members is a bone of contention to some tourism operators in the conservancy. Conservancy members reason that although tourism operators use resources such as wildlife and the land for business, which is the devolved ownership of the UTC community, some operators do not contribute towards the conservancy fund. Mowani mountain camp, a private tourism operator is alleged for not paying its conservancy fee, while Aba-Huab campsite is claimed to make sporadic payments towards the conservancy fund.

“Mowani and Aba-Huab don’t contribute to the conservancy fund; they don’t pay their conservancy fees”  (conservancy member, research interviews)

These undertakings are in contravention with the signed agreement with the conservancy office, and are contested by the conservancy members. Although formal discourse and legislations employed in UTC stress the importance of benefit sharing, not all actors abide by this rule, and they blame it on the unresolved leaseholds in the conservancy.

Moreover, based on fieldwork observation, non-paying tourism operators includes ‘a conservancy fee’ in their brochures or on their website, to reassure tourist and authorities that a certain amount will be disbursed to the conservancy fund. However, they don’t pay the money to the conservancy fund, even though they receive the conservancy fee. Some operators are therefore denying the conservancy members benefits that are formally due to them, hence contributing to adverse relationships between themselves and the conservancy members, as was noted by this committee member.
“When they wanted to start their business we were all here, sitting together and agreed, we are the ones who allocated that land to them for them to build there and to operate their business, but now when they became rich they kicked us out they do not regard us as anymore” (CMC member, research interview)

The ownership of resources is another contested debate in the conservancy. Conservancy members are well aware of the resources that were devolved to them by the state through the Nature Amendment Act. Members know that the land and wildlife was devolved to them by government. They are also aware that all built up infrastructures such as the conservancy office, and all the conservancy assets belongs to them collectively, and that the Twyfelfontein country lodge is part of the conservancy’s physical assets. However, conservancy members are not well acquainted concerning the ownership of TWHS. Various discourses exist concerning the ownership of the Twyfelfontein heritage site, which is extensively elaborated in the NHC arrangement below.

**Official discourses: The NHC policy arrangement**

The passing of the National Heritage Act in 2004 and the UNESCO declaration of TWHS in 2007 have changed the interactive patterns and the political environment of UTC. The evolution of this development brought new concepts and narratives which changed the way the TWHS is talked and thought about.

Whereas the distribution of benefits and ownership of resources are the main debates in the conservancy policy; participation, ownership of resources and revenue sharing are the main debates contested by the conservancy members in the NHC arrangement.

As stipulated in the Heritage Act, the main objective of NHC is to conserve and preserve the heritage resources of the country for the future generations. According to the Act (see Box 3.2), the conservation of heritage resources should involve the local community members. In addition to that, the heritage resource should engender pride and a sense of ownership among community members, to nurture the conservation of these resources. Moreover, the Heritage Act emphasizes the importance of promoting public understanding of Namibia’s heritage. NHC is therefore tasked to make sure that local actors in UTC know and understand the operations of the NHC.

Although official NHC discourses claim that the CMC are participating in the management of TWHS, this viewpoint is contested by conservancy members. Member’s feels excluded from TWHS and reason that even though they used to manage the heritage site in the past, the NHC has striped the conservancy
from any level of participation and NHC is the sole decision making authority of TWHS. Although NHC regard the CMC as partners and the UTC community as stakeholders in the management of the site in formal discourses, they are not equal partners in practice.

“The site itself is managed by the heritage council; they are the managers of the site. The Conservancy members are just stakeholders in terms of decision-making, but I don’t think they are participating, they are being told what to. But I don’t think they really make decisions, most of the decisions come from the heritage council. They should be participating, that was the whole idea, that there should be some decision-making…. so I think there are levels in terms of where they should be involved and levels where I think it’s the heritage council to takes certain decision.” (NGO member, research interview)

Even NGO’s and supporting organizations seems to have minimal information concerning NHC and they too, feel that they are not participants in the activities of the NHC in UTC.

“We were in the initial stages of setting up the national heritage site. We were stakeholders that were consulted and we were working through involving the conservancy as part of that. But after the site was registered, there was a bit of sidelining going on. We were not regarded as stakeholders anymore, our opinions were not really taken into account….We feel a little bit that we were used to get the site going, and after the site was formed, our opinions were no more needed.” (NGO member, research interviews)

The ownership of resources is another concept which is debated in the conservancy and the word ‘resource’ has become an ambiguous term in the conservancy. Members are confused by the fact that the heritage site is no longer resorting under the resources devolved to them by MET, to derive benefits from, through tourism development. Conservancy members do not know with certainty to whom the site belongs. Some members said it belong to the government while others believed; it belongs to the TA, as they are observed in resolving conflict with the guides, while others said it is a private company. The NHC regard the Twyfelfontein heritage site as a national asset. However, with the new acclaimed status of the heritage site, discourses have changed from viewing TWHS as a national asset, to a resource that needs to be preserved for the future generation of the world. UTC members reasoned that although they are part of the nation, and the closest to the heritage site, they do not have a sense of ownership of TWHS, this uncertainty was voiced by a conservancy member:

“With the heritage site I don’t know, before it was ours it belonged to the community now we don’t know if it is ours” (conservancy member, research interview)
Even though NHC was given the mandate to manage TWHS on behalf of the state, the conservancy members view TWHS as the main resource or asset that the conservancy possesses. The fact that the entire management of the site is in the hands of the NHC brings a nostalgia of colonial conservation and UTC members feel that they are alienated from the heritage that they used to manage for years. These divergent viewpoints concerning the ownership of resources by the two arrangements have affected relations in the conservancy as witnessed by this statement.

“Now that the NHC came in like a private company.... It is like the old South-African army what they are doing here” (Conservancy member, research interview).

Benefit sharing is another debated discourse in the conservancy. Even though benefit sharing is regarded as an important aspect by the Conservancy Policy, it is not acknowledged or prioritized by the NHC arrangement. The livelihood activities of the local community are not considered within the NHC arrangement. The NHC regards the heritage site as a national asset, and is therefore not responding to the local community needs, even though the site is situated in an area where the livelihood priorities of the locals are considered vital for resource protection. The conservancy members however, reason that the NHC is generating a lot of revenues at the site, but it is not sharing any benefits with the conservancy community, neither is it contributing to the development of the area.

“NHC is not paying the conservancy anything; they did not even build something here, all the money is going to Windhoek” (conservancy member, research interview).

The divergence in the objectives of the arrangements caused problems to the local community and has influenced relations between the NHC and the conservancy community. Similar conditions were also observed in a study done by Lapeyere (unpublished document) concerning the operations of NHC over the Brandberg National Monument in the Tsiseb conservancy. The Tsiseb community and the Daureb mountain guides are also not happy with the operations of the NHC over the Brandberg Mountain in the Tsiseb conservancy (Lapyere, unpublished document).

Regarding the objective of educating the local community about the National heritage, the NHC is using the guides and its employed staff in the conservancy. The Twyfelfontein Guides Association is an organization contracted by the NHC. The guides know and understand the operations, the objectives and the vision of the NHC very well. It is comprehensible that the guide’s knowledge levels pertaining the NHC will surpass those of other actors, as they are close participants with the NHC, on a day-to-day basis. Based on fieldwork data and observations, the NHC uses the guides association to represent the
conservancy members, even though not all the guides are members of UTC. NHC uses the knowledge levels of the guides as a basis that the information regarding it and its operations will have a ripple effect or will trickle down to the rest of the conservancy community. Working on assumptions does not warrant information flow, and the NHC needs to work very hard to change community perceptions and create awareness of its role in the conservancy.

3.6 The implications of the policy arrangements on the UTC community
The Conservancy Policy and NHC, share a common standpoint with regard to conservation and the sustainable utilization of resources. Even though the two arrangements are complimentary in text, their operations differ.

The Conservancy Policy has devolved partial rights of land and natural resources to the UTC community and the policy is very explicit with regard to the distribution of benefits that derives from the conservation of these resources. Moreover, MET which is representing the state, maintained ‘its hands-off-approach’ and is not claiming anything which accrue from the conservation of resources in UTC. On the other hand NHC is also tasked to manage heritage resources on behalf of the state, in UTC. However, NHC is a semi-governmental organization hence, needs to generate revenues to cover operational costs and to maintain other heritage sites in the country. Although these perspectives are externally congruent concerning the protection of resources, they are internally incoherent in regard to their implementation, and has adversely influenced relations in the conservancy.

There are a number of uncertainties regarding the implementation of the two policies in the conservancy. The first ambiguity is the fact that NHC solely manages TWHS without the participation of the conservancy members, although the issue of community participation is enshrined in both arrangements. The absence of participation has influenced relations between the NHC and conservancy members and has created tacit animosity between these two actors. Secondly, the Heritage Act did not make provision for benefit sharing with the local community for the preservation of national heritage, while the conservancy policy regard benefit sharing as an important incentive in the conservation of resources. These divergent viewpoints are not well understood by the UTC members. Conservancy members reasoned that NHC is operating on conservancy land and is accruing revenues from the site but do not contribute any benefits to the conservancy fund.
“Even NHC must give us a share, because we are the ones that look after the land....the land belongs to government and the government told us to look after it and all business on conservancy land must give us a share” (conservancy committee member, research interview)

These unclear rights have caused tensions and weakened relations among actors. These conditions can jeopardize institutional stability and hamper the conservation of resources in UTC, if not addressed.

Thirdly, the fact that the distribution of benefits is not formalized in the Heritage Act makes it difficult for the NHC to act concerning this matter. The absence of a formal guideline concerning revenue sharing gives the NHC freedom to make ‘their own decisions’ concerning the distribution of benefits, when these sites are situated on conservancy land. The vagueness of the Heritage Act concerning community participation makes it difficult for NHC to determine the levels of community participation and to realistically employ community participation in NHC affairs. The absence of additional guidelines and regulations makes it difficult to understand the work of NHC beyond the formal rule of managing and preserving the cultural heritage for future generations.

Finally, although NHC and UTC were both enacted by the state and operate on state land in communal areas, the power relations of these two institutions differ. The differences are determined by the power muscle that these actors possess in the policy domain. The NHC arrangement consist of actors who operate on national and international level, while the CMC and tourism operators operate on local and regional level only. These power differences have an effect on the participation level of the local community and the ownership of resources in the conservancy. The issue of participation in UTC remains a delicate one, due to the power differences, while real access have to be fought for and defended by CMC and TA more, than other players. These situations might render the conservancy management powerless as representatives in decision making and the sharing of benefits.

The formal and informal procedures and routines of interaction have influenced the relations between the different players differently in the conservancy. Although formal and informal rules are in place and are clear and complimentary in text, they are not so in practice. Laws are not carried out according to the agreed procedures, while some are not well understood by some actors in the conservancy. The reason for the lack of knowing, can be attributed to the fact that local rural communities in general are not very conversant with legislation, and the absence of institutional linkages has worsen the interactive communication channels in UTC. The way rules are carried out, will impinge on the way resources are
managed in the conservancy and can negatively impact upon the livelihood of conservancy members, hence diminishing the main objective of the institution of communal conservancies.

The fact that NHC is having access to the most valuable and most sought after resource in the region, placed NHC in a position to use their power in the recruitment of people and the distribution or denial of benefits to the conservancy members. The sustainable conservation discourses, which portray TWHS as a national asset, and now a world asset, have made the NHC an even more powerful actor in the conservancy.

All activities in UTC, takes place on conservancy land and the conservancy community interest should be considered in the distribution of resources, as their actions can affect the operations in the conservancy. It is important for the operators to have the support of locals to manage resources sustainably. The UTC community is making a living from tourism generated through the TWHS and the natural attractions in the area, it is therefore in their interest to maintain and sustain the source of their income. The UTC community claim that they need to participate as partners in the preservation of the TWHS, which they believe is part of their heritage, and that they are also part of the nation that the NHC proves to represent.

Even though the core management of heritage sites is ideal, it is important that the interest level of participation and the benefits of all stakeholders are clearly outlined understood and taken into consideration in order to propel the smooth function of stakeholders involved.
Conclusion

In sum, one can conclude that stakeholders in UTC are sharing a common standpoint, when conservation and the sustainable utilization of resources are concerned. However, the general awareness and sensitization of the intended outcome of the two policy arrangements, still lacks the urgency of all stakeholders in the conservancy.

Sufficient coherence, which embodies the 3 divisions of congruence entailing strategic, internal and external congruence, as indicative measures of the two policy arrangements employed in the conservancy is absent (Arts & Goverd, 2006; Gossum et al., 2011).

The element of power is at play in UTC and it threatens the internal congruency of the two arrangements. Internal congruency refers to the coherence of the 4 features of the policy dimension (Actors, rules, resources and discourses) (Arts & Goverd, 2006; Gossum et al., 2011). Even though actors such as the tourism operators, the conservancy management committee and NHC, are in the position to influence and implement change, the implementation of rules, and the interpretation of laws is influenced by the hidden power which some actors possess (more) in the policy domain. The fact that the UTC pioneers possesses inherent power, own to their position in society, gave them access to resources in the conservancy. The NHC on the other hand holds more power in the policy domain, as it is preserving TWHS as a national asset and comprise of national and international actors in the management of the site, compared to the other actors who operate on local level only. This situation has caused inequality among actors, and the unequal power relations determine the distribution of resources, irrespective of the set rules and regulations in the conservancy. Powerful actors such as NHC and the ‘UTC pioneers’ therefore, wield more power, compared to conservancy members who are the weaker regulators in the conservancy.

NHC is a parastatal hence, resorting under the markets in the organization of society in UTC. The NHC as a parastatal needs to generate revenues to cover its operational costs and contribute to the national treasury. The distribution of benefits to conservancy members will therefore be challenging to NHC, particularly owing to the fact that benefit sharing is not acknowledged by the Heritage Act. Revenue sharing to conservancy members is therefore not applied by NHC. Although revenue sharing is stipulated in the conservancy policy, a local tourism operator such as Aba-Huab campsite do not share benefits with the conservancy members, while a private tourism operator like Mowani mountain camp
share benefits with the wrong recipients in the conservancy. These different actions from actors, impedes the internal congruence of the policy arrangements in the conservancy.

The NHC and some tourism operators are trivializing the important link of the local community as an important stakeholder, by recognizing them as partners in official discourses but denying them participation in practice. If the issue of participation is trivialized and when communities are excluded and alienated from the heritage resource, community members become disempowered. This situation undermines and contradicts the government’s initiative of empowering rural communities, hence might render the conservation program unsustainable. These views undermine the external congruence of both policy interventions, who regard the conservation of resources as a tool for development; a component which is entrenched into broader governmental development policies and planning.

Some actors are using the conservancy, as an institutional tool to extend their own agenda. They are only concerned with their own developmental plan and do not seems to work towards a collective goal, which can include the UTC community and perhaps the Kunene region at large. This position can be connoted to the different ways actors’ views the policy arrangements, known as strategic congruence. Strategic congruency refers to the ways or perspectives different actors interpret or observe policies. The fact that the conservancy policy regard the distribution of benefits and ownership of resources as an important element of conservation, while the NHC do not consider it an important aspect, signify structural incoherence and can lead to unmet objectives.

Diverse cultural and political viewpoints are also used to mobilize resources to benefit some members of the conservancy, over others, a move which can problematize the question of representation. While the lack of prudent governance and impatience concerning development among conservancy members, can cause members to lose hope in their representatives and the whole conservation concept. These different viewpoints can hamper the strategic congruence of the two arrangements and can prevent the realization of the desired policy’s impacts in the conservancy.

It is obvious that complete harmony cannot be attained due to the changing nature of policy processes, such as new actors joining the policy domain, like the NHC in UTC, as well as the difference between the theoretical conceptions of the policy and the practical real life situations on the ground. These inconsistencies should however not weigh too much as to impinge upon the policy implementation process (Arts and Goverd 2006).
CHAPTER 4

4 THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE TWO ARRANGEMENTS ON LIVELIHOODS ACTIVITIES IN UTC

Introduction

The previous chapter dealt in detail about the enactment, the implementation and the implications of the two policy interventions on UTC members. Chapter 4 describes how the two policy arrangements have shaped livelihoods, by evaluating the contribution of each arrangement on the livelihood activities of the conservancy community.

This chapter is divided into two main parts; Sections 4.2 discusses the implications of the arrangements on the livelihoods assets and outcomes of conservancy members and 4.3 evaluate the bearing of the arrangements on the livelihood strategies and the vulnerability context of UTC members.

The Sustainable Livelihood Framework (SLF) was used as an analytical tool to evaluate the impact of the two arrangements on the livelihood activities of the conservancy members.

Community livelihoods

The outcome of community livelihoods in UTC was mainly shaped by the deployment of the two policy arrangements in the conservancy. Below I elaborate on the contribution of each of the arrangements to the livelihood activities of conservancy members.

4.1 The contributions and implications of the policy arrangements, on the livelihood outcomes of conservancy members

In this section, the five capital assets of the SLF (financial capital, social capital, human capital, physical capital and natural capital), are used to describe how the policy implications of the two arrangements have contributed towards the livelihood outcomes of conservancy members. A comparison of livelihood outcome is also drawn between the NHC and other operators in the conservancy to assess their contribution on the individual and collective level of conservancy members.

Financial implications and outcome

One of the threefold aims of the conservancy policy is to assist the government with rural development. One way of attaining financial capital, is for the conservancy to use its capacity as an institutional organization to lobby for resources from regional office or from private and donor organizations, which should trigger development in the conservancy. The other institutional tool the conservancy can use is
through tourism development or local Community Based Organizations (CBOs) such as crafts shops or cultural performances to secure the flow of financial capital in the conservancy.

Within a time frame of fifteen years, the UTC has seen the development of five tourism enterprises which include two eco-lodges, a country lodge, a mountain camp and three campsites. The living museum is the latest edition of tourism enterprise development in the conservancy. These enterprises have secured direct and indirect employment opportunities to conservancy members.

The Twyfelfontein Country Lodge, being the biggest in size among all other tourism enterprises in the conservancy, employs the most conservancy members (see figure 4.1). However, concerning access to employment as a resource in the conservancy, divergent opinions were noted in the recruitment process. Some tourism enterprises are having very few or no conservancy members employed even though conservancy members claim to apply for positions at these enterprises. However, manager’s responded that conservancy members do not return to work for a week or two after receiving their salaries, and in the process dismissed themselves. Others said that conservancy members are spoilt, and they know that they will receive cash payments from their conservancy and do not want to work. Due to these problems, managers are opting to employ people who are not from the conservancy, thus securing that employees will be working for a longer period of time. This viewpoint was confirmed by an employed conservancy member who said:

“Some people don’t want to grow up; when they are paid they stay away from work” (Employed conservancy member, research interview).

The owner of the Damara living museum, a conservancy member himself, provides employment to 5 conservancy members at the living museum. Besides employment creation, he has also transformed his own life by becoming an entrepreneur, providing jobs to the UTC community members and has added to tourism development in the conservancy.

“I was working at the Twyfelfontein Country Lodge, I was doing porter work, carrying luggage, and when I got the idea of the living museum I left work and started to develop the living museum because my main aim is to generate my own income and create job opportunities for the local people.” (Owner and manager of Living museum, research interview)
Figure 4.1 The percentages of conservancy members employed by the different operators in UTC

Figure 4.1 indicate the percentage of conservancy members employed by the different operators in the conservancy. Even though the percentages appear high, they need to be viewed in relation to the actual number of employees at each institution, as indicated by the line graph in figure 4.1. For example the conservancy office employ 100% conservancy members, but the total number of people is only 8, compared to Mowani which is having a total number of 40 employees and only 3 people are conservancy members while Abba-Huab campsite is having 15 people employed, but not a single one is a conservancy member. Nevertheless, employment opportunities have transformed lives in UTC and have created a trickledown effect of finances within the conservancy, something which was absent before the establishment of the area as a conservancy.

Owing to the money that accrues to the conservancy fund through bed night levies, the conservancy is able to pay each member a cash benefit at the beginning of each year. In the past when conservancy members were fewer, these payments could reach up to N$5000-00 (USD$550.00) per person. However, due to the increasing number of members over the years, the amount paid to members has shown a decline and at the beginning of this year (2014) each conservancy member received a cash payment of only N$1000-00 (USD$100-00). The money is paid in the beginning of the year, to coincide with the new school calendar, for parents to be able to pay school fees and buy school uniform for their
children. The fact that all members are getting the cash payment, is used as an incentive for resource conservation and secondly, as an initiative for members to improve their way of living, by starting businesses or projects that can contribute to the development of the area. Some members bought some livestock with their cash payments and farm part time on a small scale basis. Two more shops were also opened by members with the contribution of cash payments, bringing the total number of shops to 3 in the conservancy. There are unfortunately some members who used all their cash payment on alcohol.

The conservancy fund is also providing food rations to all pensioners in the conservancy on a monthly basis. (Pensioners in UTC are people who are 60 years old and above). Beside the monthly N$500-00 (USD $50) pension fee that all pensioners are receiving from the government in Namibia, the UTC provides an additional N$400-00 (USD $40) food rations to each of their pensioners. The conservancy administrators buy the food in bulk from the nearest towns and distribute the food rations to the elderly in the conservancy. Beside the elderly, the conservancy management has also identified orphans and vulnerable members, (with the assistance of conservancy members) who are supported financially by the conservancy fund on a monthly basis. The conservancy office is also paying N$ 10 000-00 (USD$ 1000-00) towards funeral cost for each of their members.

“The conservancy is providing food for the elderly every month and we are also supporting the orphans with food and money on a monthly basis” (conservancy administrator, research interview)

The conservancy office is offering employment to its members. The office is having a permanent staff of 8 people consisting of an administrative clerk, receptionists, driver and some game guards, while some members are working on a contractual basis for the conservancy. The office also assists members and individuals financially who want to start some income generating projects in the conservancy. Conservancy members should however present a business plan to the conservancy management for approval before the projects can be supported financially. The conservancy was for example able to assist the living museum in its initial stages and is currently paying people working in a garden project, until the project is financially stable.

The garden which is situated in a village called Dimab, is not a conservancy project but was funded by external donors through the institutional capacity of the area as a conservancy. The conservancy office is assisting conservancy members working in the garden with a monthly allowance, until the garden is financially viable. The garden can serve as a market for local produce once it reached its full potential. The first harvested produce such as spinach onions and tomatoes were sold to the lodges in the
conservancy. The garden can help the lodge managers to cut cost on these produce by directly buying it from the garden, and the farmers can use the money to maintain the garden and to improve their livelihoods, as well as complementing people’s diets in the conservancy. This project is however threatened by a lack of water and roaming elephants who are not even deterred by the electrified fence around the garden.

All these efforts and financial contributions, by the conservancy office are geared towards the improvement of people livelihoods and to trigger development in the area.

The NHC as an operator in UTC is also financially contributing to the livelihoods of people through the provision of employment (see figure 4.2). NHC has employed some members as receptionist and cleaners and has contracted the Twyfelfontein guides association, a group of 14 people who share guiding fees with the NHC. The NHC has also sourced out the kiosk and the craft shop to the guides association. The association is running the kiosk and the craft shop at the heritage site and they were therefore able to provide employment to 3 conservancy members in those positions.

Plate 4.1 A small grocery shop in the conservancy
Plate 4.2 The Dimab garden project

**Human implications and outcome**

As part of the community empowerment program and for members to reap the benefits from conservation, the conservancy fund has contributed to the human capital in the conservancy. Although the conservancy was not able to build a school yet, the cash payments paid to members in the beginning of the year are mainly directed towards the accessibility of education to children in the nearby towns. The financial contribution to school going orphans is used to pay for their school fees and their hostel accommodation. The conservancy vehicle is also used to transport these children to school at the beginning of the school year and collect them again during holidays. The closest town where most of the children attend school is Khorixas and it is approximately 100 kilometers away from the conservancy.

The conservancy educational fund is supporting learners from primary school up to university level. The conservancy was able to educate 5 students up to university level, who graduated and joined the labor market. Although 3 of the five graduates obtained degrees in accounting, they are unfortunately not assisting the conservancy with fiscal matters such as book keeping or auditing, due to the fact that they were not contractually bound by the conservancy to assist the conservancy upon the completion of their studies. Even though the conservancy was able to secure human capital by educating its members, the absence of contractual obligations for these members, to plough back into the conservancy can be regarded as a loss of human capital to the conservancy as an institution.
Capacity building training offered to CMC by NGOs on various aspects such as budgeting, bookkeeping and management skills have also contributed to the human capital in the conservancy. The mere exposure of CMC to leadership can be considered as human capital as members become confident and empowered to take initiative and participate openly in matters that concern their lives. Committee members can also use the acquired skills in their own lives after their term of office.

The youth wing of the conservancy also received a lot of workshops and trainings either through the conservancy office or through various NGOs and supporting organizations like NACSO. The workshops and trainings conducted ranges from HIV/ AIDS, to hospitality and the management of natural resources. The conservancy game guards are also receiving continuous training in game guarding, a skill that is helping to maintain the wildlife figures in the conservancy. The game guards are also using the skills they obtained to protect themselves against problem animals such as elephant’s and rhinos found within the conservancy boundary. They can also use the information to teach local members how to behave when confronted by dangerous animals such as elephants and leopards found in the conservancy. All these skills and benefits, contribute to human capital among members, which were made possible by the establishment of the area as a conservancy.

The youth who are working as actors and guides at the living museum are not just benefiting financially from educating tourist about the Damara culture, but they are also helping with the preservation of their culture. The living museum also received some training from the living culture foundation of Namibia on issues such as pricing, presenting the living museum to tourist and how to develop the living museum. All these assistance in the form of human capital to the community members was realized due
to the status of the area as a communal conservancy. Tourism operators are also providing training to conservancy members employed at their enterprises, in tourism and hospitality related activities. Some members received training as bar tenders, as chefs and waitresses and in turn are able to train new recruits in these positions. NHC also provide training to the guides and with the new world status of the heritage site, all guides are trained to get the highest (level 3) guide training.

“I am grateful for the training that I am receiving from NHC, I myself cannot afford to pay for the training it is very expensive” (NHC guide research interview)

Plate 4.4 A NHC guides training workshop in session

Social implications and outcome

The establishment of UTC has empowered members to participate through the ballot and dialogue in matters that concern their lives. The general meetings and the AGM are platforms created by the UTC constitution for members to participate in the affairs of the conservancy. Members can also exercise their democratic right to vote for their representatives and to propose or suggest for development projects through participation. These opportunities were not available to community members before the establishment of the area as a conservancy. The collective conservation of resources and the pride brought by the ownership of the conservancy assets, contributes to social capital as an outcome that is secured by the conservancy policy.

Apart from being a physical asset, the Damara living museum has also contributed to the social capital of the conservancy by being a sign of cultural revitalization in the conservancy. Members employed at the
museum are not just benefiting financially, but are also helping to maintain the Damara culture which is perceived as a sign of pride by the rest of the community members. The living museum is affectionately known as Taotite meaning, I will not be shy or ashamed. Members of the community are therefore not shy to showcase their culture to tourist and visitors and in the process benefit financially from it. In order to curb on staged performance and to offer ‘authentic’ visitors experiences, the museum also include village tours to portray the evolution of the Damara culture which elaborates on aspects such as the Damara ‘architecture’, dress codes, farming activities and tradition, in trying to show the daily real life activities of the Damara people. Due to the prominence of the living museum, actors from the museum are also invited to perform at functions outside the conservancy, an opportunity that provide members to network with other people and to learn new ways of presenting their culture.

Plate 4.5 Some actors at the Damara living museum

Due to the high number of the young workforce in the conservancy, social networks were developed in sport and leisure activities. Soccer tournaments are organized, were people in the community participate. Sport is used as a mechanism to unite people in the conservancy and is also used as an opportunity for community members to come together, socialize and built social capital. The AGM, and even the cleaning up campaigns, which are social gatherings are translated into social capital. People
rarely come together in rural areas due to a lack of social activities and these gatherings are used as platforms where people can socialize and exchange ideas.

The conservancy youth program can also be regarded as a social network. The UTC youth, came together as members, selected their own leadership and proposed some developmental projects for the conservancy’s unemployed youth members. The youth program has approached organizations like Namibia Non-Governmental Organization Forum (NAGOF) which offered leadership training and resource management training to youth members in the conservancy. The youth program also want to tap into the environmental research program and government surveys conducted in the Kunene region for positions as research assistants and enumerators. These programs do not just provide social capital, but avail opportunities for future employment. The youth are spearheading the cleaning up campaigns in the conservancy, and also organize sport events, hereby striving to strengthen bonds among the youth and to keep themselves out of the mischief of alcohol abuse.

The conservancy as an institution, has enabled members to receive assistance from outside the borders of the conservancy and all these programs where made possible by using the conservancy as a vehicle to garner assistance.

The conservancy vehicles are also used as a form of social capital as they provide mobility to members. The vehicles are used to transport children to school and assist in transporting the sick to hospital and the elderly for their pension payments. The fact that the conservancy is looking after the elderly, the orphans the youth and vulnerable members of the conservancy, can be regarded as a sign of inclusiveness of all members.

The Twyfelfontein guide association which is contracted by the NHC can be considered as another form of social capital. Members of the association are having regular meetings or gatherings where they increase their social capital. The association was able to buy a car, which they are using to transport their members to work. Local rural people attached symbolic and social value to a car. A car is regarded as an important investment as it provides mobility to people in an area which is very remote and far from all the services. The guides association also assists each other when member’s loses relatives to death, by contributing towards the funeral cost of the family.
Plate 4.6 The Twyfelfontein Guides Association vehicle

The training that the guides are receiving from NHC is also used as social capital, as members are disseminating the acquired knowledge to the rest of the conservancy members. For example, the first aid training they received is not just used to help tourists, but they are also using the skills to offer first aid to community members and to their own family members. They are also using the hospitality and tourism training, to communicate the importance of tourists in their conservancy and the importance of conserving natural resources in their area to the rest of the community members.

The NHC has also cultivated a sense of pride and belonging among its members and with the new status of the heritage site, members employed by NHC feel that they are known throughout the world by being connected to the TWHS.

“Being at this site makes you proud, you are known worldwide” (NHC guide, research interview)

While other member’s social and human outlook has changed when they started working in close contact with the tourist at the heritage site.

“At my previous job I used to stand behind the pots, and I used to live the way I like. But when I started working at NHC, I had to work directly with the tourists and due to that I had to changed my life style. I take my appearance seriously and I had to change my manners as well, I have changed.”

(NHC employee, research interview.)
Physical implications and outcome

The conservancy was able to build a conservancy office, where the official administration of the conservancy is taking place. The conservancy hall is used for conservancy meetings and it is big enough to accommodate AGMs. This has ensured that member’s gatherings are no longer taking place under the trees or at the mercy of the weather elements. The administrative staff is also accommodated in the conservancy staff houses which made it easier for them to stay close to their work place.

Plate 4.7 The UTC head office

The conservancy vehicles are not just used for administrative purposes, but they are also used to assist in transporting members to social services such as hospitals and schools and for pension payments in the nearby town of Khorixas. The community game guards are also equipped with a car to conduct game guarding in the conservancy, something which has made their work much easier and more effective.

Built infrastructure such as various lodges and campsites in the area are also regarded as physical outcomes of the arrangements and conservancy members are entitled to have ownership of the joint venture assets after the end of the contracts with the investors according to the conservancy policy.
Another structure which has developed is the living museum, which also sells crafts to tourists at the site. Even the Dimab garden can be viewed as a physical outcome of the conservancy policy.

Due to the tourism status of the area, the conservancy is receiving a number of visitors daily. This has ensured that the roads are always kept in a good condition by the Kunene regional road authority, a service which is also benefiting the local community.

The conservancy as an institution was also able to lobby for the provision of resources from regional office. Electricity was for example, extended from the Twyelfontein country lodge to Low-Inn, one of the most populated villages in the conservancy and where most employees of the various tourism enterprises reside. The network tower (which was intended to be built next to one of the eco-lodges) was also erected very close to this village. Most people are now having access to electricity and network connection. The use of electricity has reduced the dependence on firewood as a fuel and electricity is seen as an alternative tool for development in the conservancy. The regional office was also able to
provide toilets to each house in the said village. The provision of these resources can be viewed as a contribution to rural development.

“The electricity is helping us a lot, we can cook inside the house now and our food can last a bit longer because we can put it in the fridge” (conservancy member, research interview).

The structures at the heritage sites such as the thatched car parks the pathways created for visitors to protect the rock art and the rock engravings itself are some of the physical structures that were made possible by the NHC arrangement.

It is important to note that the arrangements were instrumental in the realization of the community assets, which are used in the diversification of community livelihoods in the conservancy.

**Natural implications and outcome**

The devolution of land as user right has enabled the community to have a sense of ownership and the responsibility to maintain what is entrusted to them. It is based on the devolved ownership of land that tourism investors could invest in the area, on the leasehold of the conservancy as an institution. It was also through the demarcation of some land to NHC that the preservation of TWHS can be managed.

The devolution of wildlife and the use of game guards have resulted in a steady increase of wildlife population in the conservancy. The non-consumptive approach to wildlife as a conservation tool exercised in UTC has secured the protection of desert elephants in the area and the conservation of wildlife have not just resulted in the increase of wildlife in the conservancy, but has resulted in the return of animals such as the black rhino, gazelles and ostriches to the area. In addition, the presence of free roaming wildlife and the beautiful scenery of red sandstone rock formations found in the conservancy are benefiting the tourism operators, as they are including these natural features in their game drives in the conservancy. The organ pipes and the Burn Mountains are also natural attractions that are managed by NHC and out of which the NHC can derive revenues in addition to the rock engravings.
With the establishment of the conservancy, the land was divided into different land use zones, earmarked for different activities. Beside the small size of the conservancy, the community members sacrificed some grazing area for the sake of tourism development, and portioned some of the land to NHC for the preservation of TWHS. This was done first as an alternative for livelihood diversification, as people come first before wildlife and resources (Ashley, 2001) and secondly for the conservation of wildlife and natural resources. It is therefore essential for operators to compensate conservancy members for the sacrifices they made for the sake of conservation.
Plate 4.10 Land use zones in UTC

Source: UTC Constitution 2012

Wood is a natural resource which is under threat in the conservancy. Due to the arid conditions of the area, wood is a scarce commodity, however, wood is used as a fuel and as a building material by the community. These activities threaten the sustainability of wood and can pose long term environmental effects on this resource, if an alternative is not sought. The area is having a lot of beautiful red stones which are used by the lodges in the area as a building material to blend in with the nature. This technique can also be taught to community members, to lessen the dependence on wood as a building material which can also maintain the environmental beauty of the area.
Plate 4.11 The threat of wood as a building material in UTC

Plate 4.12 An alternative to wood as building material in the conservancy
Table 4.1 below, gives a summary of the implications of the arrangements on the community livelihood capital assets in the conservancy. The table is showing varying effects of the different operator’s contribution towards the community livelihood capital assets. The implications of the arrangements on the capital assets have a bearing on the livelihood outcomes of the conservancy, and in turn influence the livelihood strategies as elaborated in section 4.3 below. Table 4.1 shows that tourism benefits have made a visible contribution to the livelihood outcomes of conservancy members. However, even though the tourism contribution are relatively minimal towards the physical and social capital assets in the asset pentagon, it is tilted more towards the financial asset of the pentagon, an element which has enabled the conservancy office to contribute towards the community livelihood outcomes and strategies.

Table 4.1 a comparison of the operators’ impact on members’ livelihood assets and outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIVELIHOODS ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>UTC</th>
<th>TOURISM OPERATORS</th>
<th>NHC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Salaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Conservancy fund assisting vulnerable members, the youth, entrepreneurs, and the elderly financially.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Pay bed night levies to the conservancy fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Cash payments paid to each conservancy member at the beginning of the year (US$ 100-00 per person)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Buy fresh produce from Dimab Garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Bursaries and school fees Total estimated revenue from bed night levies per year US$ 120 000-00)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Provide community members access to withdraw money by using the lodge transactions systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Mobilized people in social networks such as soccer and netball clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Assist with the cleaning up campaigns e.g. (transporting refuge to dumping site, provide lunch for cleaning up campaigns.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Conservancy youth program responsible for cleaning up campaigns</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Give leftover food to pig farmers in the conservancy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Regeneration of Damara culture and tradition by living museum</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Assist during cleaning up campaigns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Transport members to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 a comparison of the operators’ impact on members’ livelihood assets and outcomes
| Human | Offer Direct and indirect employment to approximately 25 conservancy members  
- Provide access to education to members, up to university level (5 members graduated with Bachelor degrees from tertiary institutions)  
- Provide training to CMC in management skills and various training to youth members and conservancy members  
- Provide training to game guards. | - Offer direct and indirect employment to approximately 170 people (excluding Kipwe camp)  
In service training to conservancy members employed at tourism enterprises. | - Offer employment to approximately 25 people  
Offer various trainings to conservancy members employed by NHC |
|---|---|---|---|
| Physical | - Own built infrastructure such as offices, staff quarters, and community hall. | - JV lodge ownership of UTC  
- Clean the conservancy’s elephant dam and provide | - TWHS  
- Sourced the Kiosk and craft shop to guards association  
- Provided a water tank to |
4.2 Livelihood strategies and the vulnerability context

This section explains how the two arrangements influence the livelihood strategies of the conservancy members and the extent to which the interventions protect the community against the vulnerability context.

Livelihood strategies

In UTC, the two arrangements are having an effect on the livelihood assets, outcomes, strategies and the vulnerability context of members in the conservancy. Even though there are shortcomings in terms of benefit sharing, participation and access to resources, the arrangements are contributing to the development of new livelihood strategies in the conservancy as illustrated in table 4.1 above. The operations of various tourism enterprises have created employment opportunities to conservancy members.

Although tourism wages are not market related in the conservancy, tourism have created direct and indirect jobs to some conservancy members, and people have diversified their livelihood strategies with their income. Some people bought some goats and sheep and are part time farmers while others are using their earnings to send their children to school and to support their extended families.

“My children are staying with my mother and I send money every month to my mother, and I am also paying school fees for my two brothers with the money that I am receiving here” (employed member, research interview).

Three small shops which are operated by conservancy members have open as a new livelihood strategy. Some conservancy members are employed as nannies and cattle herders, while the unemployed youth
members prepare food and sell the food to the employed members in the conservancy as a form of indirect employment. The Dimab garden can also be regarded as a livelihood strategy for the Dimab community. New skills such as art and crafts were also developed and conservancy members are making crafts which they sell to tourists as a new livelihood strategy to supplement their livelihood outcomes.

The establishment of the Damara living museum can also be viewed as a new livelihood strategy. The museum is not just instrumental in securing livelihood outcomes in the form of employment and salaries, but it revitalized the waning Damara tradition and strives to prolong the Damara culture. Tourism infrastructures such as the maintenance of roads, the provision of electricity and access to cell phone and internet connection have also benefited the conservancy members and many people use electricity as an alternative developmental tool. Some members bought computers and laptops and envision offering computer courses to people for a fee, while others are using the available internet connection to study on line in order to improve their qualifications.

Nonetheless, there are still a number of viable livelihood strategies to be explored in UTC. Fieldwork data revealed that a group of women approached the conservancy office for assistance to open their own sewing project. This project will enable them to provide the tourism enterprises in the conservancy with linen and uniforms. The women are having the skills and experience as they have been sewing the Twyfelfontein country lodge (TCL) linen and uniforms for the past 14 years, but they are just paid wages as the machines and the materials belongs to TCL.

“We as women would really want the conservancy to help us with the machines to start our own needlework project..... We are already having the experience” conservancy member, research interview)

Furthermore, the absence of a day care facility in the Louws-inn village has become a problem to employed parents. Due to the absence of day care facilities, the children don’t have anyone to look after them while their parents are at work, and the children are roaming around in the village. The members also want the conservancy office to build a preschool for the children, where the children can be safe during the day.

The community also wants the conservancy to build a police station as crime started increasing due to the increase of people in the conservancy. Further still, the presence of rhinos in the area have given some game guards thought to use the knowledge and skills obtained over the years, to venture into rhino tracking as a new livelihood strategy. Even though the conservancy office is cognizant of these
propositions and has prioritized these projects in the development pipeline, members are impatient and complain that the conservancy office is taking just too long.

**Vulnerability context**

Although the conservancy policy is dynamic in the enhancement of livelihood strategies and the diversification of livelihood through tourism, the establishment of the conservancy also brought unforeseen problems such as theft, litter and lack of water. The population of UTC has grown from 64 members in 1999 to an estimated 300 people in 2013. The population increase can be attributed to the tourism employment potential of the conservancy, which has attracted a number of people to the conservancy. However, most people employed at the various tourism enterprises are not from the conservancy. This condition can partly be attributed to the fact that some conservancy members lack the skills required to be employed, and the fact that employees prefer to recruit nonmembers as conservancy members are alleged not to maintain their jobs for a long period of time. These conditions have contributed to the vulnerability of conservancy members when access to resources such as employment is concerned.

Small stock farming is still the mainstay livelihood for farmers in the conservancy. However, the small size of the conservancy, the arid conditions of the area and the zoning of land, mean smaller grazing areas for livestock farmers. This aspect has negatively affected the livelihood strategies of some community members, especially those farmers who could not be employed by the tourism operators, and who are not of age to receive pension or food rations from the conservancy. These farmers are the most vulnerable to these shocks and are negatively affected by the implications of the arrangements. These farmers’ livestock safety is threatened by roaming strangers who are looking for employment opportunities and the health of the livestock is further endangered by plastic bags lying around as a result of the influx of people in the conservancy. The conservancy is also experiencing a lot of unemployed or dismissed non-members who do not want to return to their original places but stay and cause problems in the conservancy.

“There are a lot of people who are not from the conservancy here, they are no longer working but they don’t want to go back where they came from. Now they are only causing problems in the conservancy”

(Conservancy member, research interviews)
Although tourism operators provide free accommodation to their employees, some of the free accommodation offered proves to be problematic. Accommodation at some enterprises is either in the form of tents or make shift houses which are not safe especially when sharing it with younger children.

“The accommodation here is very bad” (employee living with 2 toddlers, research interview)

Plate 4.13 Some of the free accommodation offered by tourism operators to their employees in UTC

In conclusion, the lack of water is another problem experienced by the conservancy community. Due to the semi-arid conditions of the area, water is a scarce and precious commodity. The lack of water is worsened by the population increase in the conservancy. The number of tourist that visits the conservancy also exerts a lot of pressure on the available water in the area.

Some of these shocks and trends were unintentionally created by the arrangements and are rendering some community members vulnerable to these shocks and trends, and hence need the attention and assistance of all stakeholders in the conservancy.
Table 4.2. A comparison of operators’ contributions towards individual and collective livelihood benefits and their support towards the vulnerability context of the conservancy community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operators</th>
<th>Benefit on Individual level</th>
<th>Benefits on collective level</th>
<th>Contribution towards the community vulnerability context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TLC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide employment and</td>
<td>-Provide indirect and</td>
<td>-Provide water daily to all people living in Lows- inn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>salaries to approximately 30</td>
<td>seasonal employment</td>
<td>-Availed the lodge’s main waste dump for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conservancy members</td>
<td>to conservancy members.</td>
<td>conservancy waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide free uniforms,</td>
<td>- Pay its levies to the</td>
<td>- provide lunch during cleaning up campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>water electricity and</td>
<td>conservancy fund (estimated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accommodation</td>
<td>annual payment (US$70 000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pay an inconvenience fee</td>
<td>JV agreement with UTC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to employees who could not</td>
<td>Provide access to the local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be accommodated in the staff</td>
<td>community to withdraw money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quarters due to a lack of</td>
<td>by using the lodge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>space</td>
<td>transaction service system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide food to employees</td>
<td>Buy produce from Dimab garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on duty daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide free transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from and to work daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide pension and social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>security to its employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mowani mountain camp</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide employment and</td>
<td>-Buy produce from Dimab garden</td>
<td>- Assist during cleaning up campaigns, by transporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>salaries to an estimated 5</td>
<td>-Give waste or left over</td>
<td>the refuse collected to the TCL main waste dump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conservancy</td>
<td>food to pig farmers for free</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in the conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Provide free food to employees on duty
- Provide water accommodation and electricity for free
- Provide pension and social security
- Provide free transport to the main road junction 30km out of the conservancy to its employees when on leave, to easily get a lift
- Provide in service training skills e.g. chefs, bar tenders and waitressing

Aba-Huab campsite

- Provide Employment and salaries
- Provide water accommodation and electricity for free.
- Provide food for free to its employees

Aarbadi mountain camp

- Offer employment and salaries
- Provide free accommodation to its employees

<p>|                  | Make some sporadic payments towards the conservancy fund | -pay its levies to the conservancy fund | Clean the elephant dam and provide water for elephants to avoid elephants destroying water infrastructures |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>Livelihood Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| NHC                            | • Offer employment and salaries to approximately 10 conservancy members  
• Provide free training to its members  
• Provide social security pension and medical aid to its members  
• Provide free uniforms  

Sell community crafts at the heritage site.  

Provided a water tank to the Louws-inn community for water storage  

Assist during cleaning up campaigns | -Revalorize the Damara culture and tradition  
-Sell community crafts at the living museum |
| Kipwe camp                     | * * * * * | * * * |

*no data, as accesses to the enterprise was denied.

Table 4.2 give a summary of the contribution of each of the operators, towards the collective and individual livelihood activities of people in the conservancy, and how they assist the conservancy community against vulnerabilities.

As illustrated in Table 4.2 above, operators generally contribute more on the individual level than on the collective level and even less on the vulnerability context of members. The levies paid to the conservancy fund remain the major livelihood outcome for the conservancy members.

However, when comparing the contribution of operators’ contribution to the livelihood outcomes of members, fieldwork data revealed that NHC offer better salaries to its employees compared to other
operators in the conservancy. The guides are the highest paid employees (apart from management positions) in the conservancy, with a take home salary of over N$4000-00 (about USD$400-00) during the peak season. Even during the off season, the guides salaries remain above average compared to other employees who receive a fixed salary in the conservancy. Conservancy members employed in the kiosk are paid US$130-00 by the guides association and a cleaner is paid about US$ 120-00 by NHC, which is much higher compared to waitresses and cleaners who are paid between US$70-00 and US$90-00 at some tourism enterprises in the conservancy. Observations confirmed this fact. Most guide’s houses in the Louws-inn village are equipped with flat screen TVs, washing machines, stoves, laptops and are well furnished compared to conservancy members who are not working for NHC.

Even though the high salary for NHC employees can be attributed to the fact that NHC is not paying levies to the conservancy and that its permanent staff are paid as civil servants from government, their contribution makes a difference in those member’s livelihood outcomes and it give these members more options to invest in different livelihood strategies.

The NHC is not contributing to the conservancy fund as benefit sharing with the conservancy is not yet negotiated. The Damara living museum contribute the least on the collective level, as it is regarded as a new tourism enterprise which is still in the teething process. The conservancy office was however able to establish livelihood outcomes and create livelihood strategies for its members as illustrated by figure 4.1 however, factors that render the community members vulnerable as a result of the outcomes of the arrangements, need the collective effort of all actors and stakeholders to protect the conservancy community.

Conclusion

Tourism is a new activity adopted by many people within and outside the UTC, which aim at the diversification of livelihoods. The modification of livelihoods in UTC is compelled by the semi-arid conditions of the area which do not allow livestock farming to continue as usual. The increase of the population and the decreasing grazing area have also compelled the farming community to diversify its livelihood activities.

Based on fieldwork data and literature, the two arrangements are not just concerned with the conservation of resources but are also connected to tourism. The Conservancy Policy has done a lot in terms of awareness creation, change of mindset and perception among the UTC community with regard to conservation, and the importance of tourism. Even though the NHC share the same ideals, real
community participation and benefit sharing are the key elements missing within the NHC arrangement. These two elements (community participation and benefit sharing) are crucial to harness community support towards the conservation and sustainable use of resources in the conservancy. The livelihood priority is a strong conservation pillar which is missing from NHC but which is vital for the realization of the intended outcome of both arrangements.

Concerning conservation, the arrangements have indeed contributed towards the conservation of wildlife and natural resources. Wildlife in UTC is solely used for non-consumptive tourism purposes, and this has resulted in an increase of wildlife population in the conservancy. Wood is however still threatened by population increase both as a fuel and as a building material. Although the extension of electricity to the community can be used to lessen the usage of wood as a fuel, a great number of people are still using wood as a fuel due to the high cost of electricity. Concerning rural development, the increasing number of tourism operators over a time span of 14 years have contributed towards the development of the area and most importantly led to the improvement of livelihoods activities in the conservancy. Furthermore, the institutional capacity of UTC, paired with the TWHS has increased the popularity and the competitiveness of the conservancy as a destination in the Kunene region.

The important role of NHC in the management of the nation cultural heritage cannot be trivialized, however, it should be noted that whenever the activities of NHC falls within conservancy land, special directives in terms of community participation and benefit sharing should be encouraged to secure the assistance of the local community in the protection of resources, which can be used as an avenue in the nurturing of good relations with the local community.

It is however, important to note that the conservancy office is still having room to improve the livelihood strategies of its members. Based on rough estimates, given the worst case scenario, the conservancy is generating close to 1million Namibian dollars per year (US$ 100 000-00), and that excludes the non-paying tourism operators. Given the low population of the conservancy, compared to other conservancies in the area, the conservancy is expected to do better in regard to livelihood outcomes and livelihood strategies when compared to neighboring conservancies who are having much higher populations. The provision of free primary education in Namibia caused a big relief on school fees for the conservancy fund. This relief created room for the provision of more livelihood choices for conservancy members. Although the arrangements have managed to secure some livelihood outcomes and strategies for the conservancy members, it is however, imperative for the operators to collectively
find solutions to protect the community against vulnerabilities created by the outcome of the arrangements.
CHAPTER 5

5 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction
In Namibia’s conservancy model, conservation and tourism are used as mechanisms to enhance livelihoods in Namibia’s rural areas. With the declaration of Uibasen Twyfelfontein Conservancy (UTC) as a communal conservancy in 1999, the UTC community opted for tourism and the non-consumptive use of resources as a conservation strategy and as a tool for the enhancement of livelihoods in the conservancy. However, in the same conservancy, the National Heritage Council (NHC) capitalized on the importance of conservation and tourism foundation laid by the conservancy policy, by sensitizing the need for the preservation of the Twyfelfontein heritage site to prolong its sustainability as a national asset.

This thesis was aimed at answering two main questions; what are the consequences of the employment of two policy arrangements in UTC, and how do these two arrangements impact on the livelihood activities of the local community. To answer the first question, I used the policy arrangement approach to analyze how discourses, rules of the game, actors and their coalitions and resources shaped the processes in UTC. In addition to the policy arrangement approach, I used the sustainable livelihood approach, to show the impacts of the arrangements on the livelihood activities of the local community.

This chapter presents a brief summary of the main outcomes of the study, and the chapter ends with some recommendations.

5.1 Main outcomes
The Communal Conservancy Policy has been implemented over a decade now in UTC, while the operation of NHC is exactly one decade since the Heritage Act became effective in 2004. These arrangements are having two things in common: the conservation of resources and their dependency on tourism for their sustainability.

The conservancy policy was the first policy to be enacted in UTC and the premise of the policy is the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources, which need to be realized through the devolved user rights to wildlife and natural resources given to the UTC community. The UTC community opted to use tourism as a strategy for the conservation of natural resources and the tourism benefits as
incentives for resource conservation and for the enhancement of livelihoods. The rules set by the conservancy policy were intended to maximize the sense of ownership, and have impacted upon the conservation of resources in UTC, while tourism revenues contributed to the livelihood activities of the local community. The NHC came in effect in 2004, five years after the conservancy policy was implemented in UTC and it was empowered to manage the Twyfelfontein national heritage site in the conservancy on behalf of the state. The main findings of this thesis include the following:

- With the entry of NHC as the manager of the Twyfelfontein national heritage site, it seems as if the triangle of interdependence were to be realized, where the tourism operators, the UTC management and NHC would be dependent on each other for their survival. However, the level of operation of the NHC is different from the other two main actors (conservancy management committee and the tourism operators) in the conservancy. The NHC is managing the heritage site on a national level, meaning that benefits that accrue to the NHC are for national interest and intended for the national treasury. The tourism operators and UTC on the other hand are operating on regional and local level, where benefits are envisioned to be shared among the community members. These differences in operation are not well understood by the community members and have become a bone of contention in the conservancy.

- Both arrangements followed the policy formulation procedures in their enactment, which entail the participation of various stakeholders in the rule setting process and the advancement of the rules into implemented laws. However, although both arrangements were enacted by government and operate on state land, the different actors in the conservancy are not having the same power relations. The tourism operators and the conservancy committee members operate on the local and regional level only, while the NHC is operating on a national level and now, on international level, with the new UNESCO status of Twyfelfontein. These differences in operations have contributed to unequal power relations among actors, which affect the distribution and access to resources in the conservancy, and which are identified as some of the factors that constrain the operation of development and the institutional stability in the conservancy.

The aspect of benefit sharing is absent in the Heritage Act, while the capacity of communities to participate and influence decisions in the management of the heritage site, seems aloof from the side of NHC. However, the conservancy policy promotes benefit sharing and has prioritized community participation in decision making, especially those which concern the community
livelihood. These differences in perspective, have created antagonism among actors and caused the formation of actor coalitions in the conservancy.

- Nevertheless, in terms of livelihoods, the arrangements brought a change in the livelihood assets, outcomes and strategies of the UTC community. The community has managed to diversify their livelihoods by opening tourism related enterprises such as the Damara living museum and two craft shops. Small businesses such as grocery shops have opened and the conservancy office have been instrumental in enhancing the community livelihoods outcome and strategies through the provision of cash payments to each conservancy member. The cash payments enabled farmers to buy some livestock, send their children to school and buy food from nearby towns.

- The conservancy fund is also providing food rations to orphans and the elderly, and has made social services such as schools, medical services and pension payments accessible to its members. Bursary schemes for members have contributed to the human capital of the conservancy members and development projects continue to receive assistance from the conservancy office. Furthermore, the arrangements have created job opportunities to its members, given the scarcity of employment opportunities due to the remoteness of the conservancy. Tourism revenues are also used to cover the operational and administrative cost of the conservancy office.

In sum, there is no doubt that the two arrangements are having an impact on the conservation of resources and that their operations have impacted the livelihood activities of the conservancy members. However, the incoherence of the arrangements concerning community participation, the distribution of benefits and access to resources, need to be addressed as it can weaken relations, jeopardize institutional stability and threaten the conservation of resources if the policies do not respond to the social needs of the local community.

5.2 The NHC and UTC as policy arrangements
The body of literature on conservation and conservancies (Ashley, 2000; Ashley & Roe, 1998; Goodwin & Spencely, 2007; Novelli & Gebhardt, 2007; Sullivan, 2002) emphasizes the involvement of communities in resource conservation. It also stresses the importance for the empowerment of local rural communities to manage their own affairs and to make decisions regarding their own lives. However, in the case of UTC, these objectives were met to a certain extend.
On the one hand, the UTC community has been empowered to manage land, natural resources and wildlife. They were authorized to use the land for tourism or any other activity of their choice which can enhance their livelihood, as long as these activities were not in contravention with the conservation of natural resources.

Concepts such as benefit sharing, sustainable development and the empowerment of rural people were some statements used in the sensitization for the establishment of conservancies. Laws were put in place to transfer these discourses into binding laws and rules and organizational institutions known as conservancies were established with the expectation to engender the conservation of bio-diversity and to enhance livelihoods. The Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) played a crucial role in the mobilization of the UTC community, to embrace the establishment of the area as a conservancy. MET managed to create awareness and changed community’s perceptions concerning the usage of natural resources and wildlife, and the communities were involved in all negotiations from the onset. MET (representing the government) kept its word and maintained a hands-off-approach concerning governance and the management decisions of communities, and has not required any dividends from revenues that accrued from conservancies as institutions. The government through MET however, maintained to offer capacity building to conservancies with the assistance from private companies and NGOs in empowering conservancies with training and skills in financial managements, budgeting and governance to be able to manage the conservancies well. The involvement of MET in UTC can be attest by Ashley and Roe (1998) who note that, government action or inaction can affect community involvement in tourism.

Although the conservancy policy arrangement is structurally coherent and relatively participatory, the government hands-off-policy is affecting the UTC community. The issue of leaseholds in UTC has been dragging for over a decade now and MET as the authoritative body for communal conservancies and tourism development in general, have been reluctant to call the culprits to order and to resolve this problem once and for all. This situation has placed the conservancy management in an awkward position in representing the conservancy members’ interests and has limited the conservancy members’ options to diversify their livelihood choices. Ashley & Roe (1998) confirmed this, by alluding that ‘removing constraints is as important as creating new incentives’ (Ashley & Roe, 1998; p. 30).

Regarding the conservation aspect, wildlife populations have increased due to the non-consumptive strategy used to conserve wildlife in UTC, and some rhinos and cheetahs were spotted by game guards as returning wildlife in the conservancy. However, the population of elephants and predators such as
leopards and jackals has also increased, and elephants threaten scarce resources such as water in the conservancy. These and the fact that tourism revenues have contributed to the livelihood activities of the locals is an indication that the conservancy policy is working and the government recognized the role of the UTC community, in wildlife and natural resource management. The conservation success of the conservancy policy in UTC is a result of thorough consultation with different stakeholders and the local community, as well as patience exercised from the government, the local community and the tourism operators, before any results could be measured. The conservancy policy has identified benefit sharing as critical in giving people incentives to conserve biodiversity in conservancies and these benefits need to be felt by all members of the community especially the poor (Elliott & Sumba, 2011)

The conservancy policy however, is not a straightforward arrangement but it is characterized by a myriad of conditions. The UTC is subjected to a lot of procedures and a multiplicity of activities. The registration of a conservancy is a long and complex process which requires the input from diverse stakeholders ranging from lawyers, cartographers, various governmental organizations, the private sector and NGOs. The search for tourism investors and the negotiation process with joint ventures is a lengthy and tiresome process. The land tenure is an ongoing process of flux and change which include the amendment and implementation of new land laws and the introduction of new organizational representative such as regional land boards and traditional authorities on local level.

There’s a multiplicity of stakeholders that the CMC should liaise with, while benefit distribution and the drafting and amendment of the conservancy constitution, is a lengthy organizational aspects that can distort the conservancy management. These various interferences are not always compatible with each other and can lead to inefficiency in the enhancement of livelihoods. This is an indication that policy processes are always continually undergoing change and are shaped by new resources, time, the dynamics of actors and the introduction of new policies.

NHC on the other hand did not use the same approach as MET in the sensitization of the local community concerning the preservation of the Twyfelfontein heritage site. The entry of NHC as a new actor has changed the status quo in the conservancy, new actors emerged and new rules were implemented. The NHC as a new actor also changed the culture of the conservancy and discourses also changed. The Twyfelfontein heritage site is no longer asserted as a resource for the UTC community, but is regarded as a national asset and a symbol of pride for the Namibian nation, hence should benefit all Namibians. With the acclaimed world status of TWHS, new discourses also emerged that do not just call
for the preservation of TWHS for Namibia’s future generations, but discourses that also call for the preservation of the heritage site for the world.

Although the official appropriation of TWHS by NHC was preceded by familiarization workshops, seminars and conferences held in 2004 and 2005, the local community felt that they were treated like the general public in these familiarization meetings. The local community argues that they were sidelined and treated indifferently as actors by the NHC arrangement, although they were responsible for the upkeep of the heritage site on behalf of the NHC for years. The local community claims that they were not involved and were not consulted in the rule formation processes and were not well informed concerning organizational changes in the conservancy. Seemingly, this situation partly contributed to the controversy between the NHC and the conservancy as actors in the arrangement.

The fact that the misunderstanding and the discontentment of the community still lingers on, a decade after the presence of NHC in the area, is an indication that the NHC did not sensitize the community very well. The issue of community participation and benefit sharing was also not well communicated to the general UTC community before NHC took over the management of the heritage site. The NHC has also not done much mobilization over the years as the NHC discourses are still contested by the local community. Research results reveal that little awareness and mobilization was done from the NHC side, as characterized by the lack of interaction with the local actors, as well as external actors like MET Kunene Region, and NGOs such as WWF, and NACSO, who claim that there is not a strong institutional link between themselves and the NHC. The fact that the NHC found salvage or security in being a legal entity operating on state land and backed by the Heritage Act, trivialized the importance of the community as a vital link in the protection of resources. It is therefore essential that constant sensitization is undertaken to eliminate controversy among actors and to guarantee good relations in achieving the intended goals of the arrangements.

A comparison of the two arrangements reveals both similarities and differences in terms of actors, rules discourses and resources. In terms of similarities, both arrangements were initiated by the national government for the conservation of resources. The two arrangements advocate for the sustainable utilization of resources and both arrangements use tourism as a conservation strategy, and depend on tourism for their sustainability. Although the aims of the arrangements are complementary, their operations and implementations differ and this has caused the formation of coalitions in UTC. The local coalition challenge the rules and resources govern by NHC and contest the NHC discourses in the conservancy. Tourism operators, although not very interactive with the NHC are cooperating with the
NHC, as they share the same resource and the same clientele, hence sharing similar viewpoints and using the arrangement to obtain their respective goals. General effective institutional linkages are absent between actors in UTC, which is observed by the poor communication and information flow among stakeholders in the conservancy. Actor’s participation in NHC affairs is absent and relations remain problematic in UTC. Similar conditions were also observed in a study done by Lapyere (unpublished document) in the Tsiseb conservancy in the Erongo region. The Tsiseb community and the Daureb Mountain Guides also portray discontent concerning the operation and the management of the NHC over the Brandberg National Monument.

In terms of differences, the variations between the arrangements are reflected in both the organizational and substantial dimension of the arrangements. Even though the official discourses enshrined in the aims and objectives of the two arrangements reflects the broader conservation of resources, they differ in the process and functions of attaining their aims and objectives, an aspect which threatens the internal congruency of the arrangements. The conservancy policy for example, uphold the believe that the collective management of resource will go a long way in the sustainability of wildlife and natural resources, if tourism revenues are invested back into the community as an incentive for resource protection. The NHC on the other hand operate as a parastatal on business principles and function in the interest of the nation. NHC believes that it is the UTC community moral duty as Namibian citizens to preserve the national assets for the country’s future generation, while revenues generated at the site should benefit all Namibians. These differences in the arrangements have created antagonism among actors. Although a platform such as the Joint Management Meetings can be used as an avenue to iron out differences among actors, the power differences among actors in these meetings can still held sway.

Even though both arrangements are externally congruent, meaning both arrangements advocate for the conservation of resources, the processes in the attainment of conservation are not complementary, making the arrangements internally incongruous. This is also noted by Ashley & Roe (1998) who state that new policies and their procedures sometimes unintentionally negatively affect the local community.

In conclusion, the incongruences of the arrangements can create conflict among actors and can jeopardize the conservation of resources in the conservancy. The situation can also deny community members benefits that are officially due to them, for sacrifices made for resource conservation in the conservancy. It is therefore imperative for new policies to be in harmony with existing policies, for both policies to achieve their intended objectives, without negatively affecting the local community.
5.3 The implications for local livelihoods

Both arrangements have had an impact on community livelihoods in UTC. The conservancy policy invested natural assets to the UTC community with the devolution of user rights in 1999. Since then, structures such as the conservancy office, tourism joint venture enterprises, the land and wildlife have remained the community physical and natural assets. The community has exploited these assets to enhance their livelihood outcomes and strategies. In addition, the conservancy arrangement enabled the UTC to use its legal institutional capacity to boost development in the conservancy. The UTC was instrumental in lobbying for developmental projects such as the construction of internet connection through the regional office. Tourism infrastructure such as electricity was also extended to benefit the local community. Since electricity is in itself a development tool, conservancy members have capitalized on electricity as a livelihood strategy and have started small projects like shops, while some community members have acquired laptops and are studying on line in order to increase their human capital which will make them employable in the conservancy tourism market or in any other job market in the region.

Employment opportunities offered by the different tourism enterprises and cash benefits paid to members by the conservancy office, are viewed as financial capital which contribute to the community livelihood outcomes and strategies. However, the cash payments have shown a decrease over the years. Registered conservancy members grew from 65 members in 1999 to 196 members to date. In 2001 each member received USD$ 500.00 however, over the last two years, payments have decreased from US$ 250.00 in 2012 to US$ 100.00 in 2014, while no cash payments were paid to members in 2013 due to a lack of funds. Although conservancy members have increased threefold over the past decade, it seems as if the tourism revenues remained the same over the years, even though the number of tourists visiting the area have increased and new tourism operators started business in the conservancy. The decrease in cash payment can be attributed to the increase of conservancy members who are eligible for cash payments, but it can also be credited to tourism enterprises that do not pay their levies to the conservancy fund, a situation that can limit the livelihood options of conservancy members.

Needless to say, amidst all the shortcomings, the conservancy office has managed to create a variety of livelihood benefits for its members, ranging from financial capital such as financial contributions made towards funeral cost of conservancy members, and human capital such as training and the provision of primary, secondary and tertiary education to members in the conservancy. The conservancy fund is also financially supporting development projects in the conservancy.
Although tourism revenues are benefiting community members through the conservancy fund, most tourism operators invest more on the individual level of their employees, than on the collective level. Individual investment include benefits such as employment, in-service training and free accommodation. The newly developed Damara living museum is not just offering cultural experiences of the ‘other’ to tourist, but has led to the valorization of the Damara culture and tradition which is valued and regarded as a sign of pride among the conservancy community.

The NHC has managed to offer employment opportunities to about 10 conservancy members, but it is evident that the NHC is having little community input, hence contributes very little to the community livelihood options apart from the salaries paid to the employed members which trickle down to household level. The rules and procedures of the NHC arrangement do not make provision for revenue sharing with the local community. Conversely, although NHC has recruited only some conservancy members and do not pay revenues to the conservancy, it has offered livelihood options by sourcing the kiosk and the craft shop to the Twyfelfontein Guards Association (which the NHC regard as representing the conservancy members) and the guards association was able to recruit conservancy members in these positions.

In terms of conservation and its contribution to livelihoods, the arrangements have managed to change the community perceptions concerning wildlife. Poaching is rarely taking place in the conservancy, due to the well-trained and efficient game guards. Even though elephants sometimes destroy infrastructure and crops, the human-wildlife conflict fund compensates community members for losses to their livestock caused by predators such as leopards and destruction caused by elephants. Although the compensation is not equivalent to the value of the lost product, it creates tolerance towards wildlife among members in the conservancy. The increasing number of wildlife recorded in the conservancy is owed to the UTC constitution, that regard the conservancy as a wildlife park and animals that escape from trophy hunters in other conservancies find refuge in UTC.

In conclusion, the arrangements have indeed contributed to rural development, and have enhanced community’s livelihoods through cash payments and the empowerment of members through various trainings offered by several organizations in the conservancy.

However, despite the benefits of the arrangements, there are several challenges in the deployment of the two policy arrangements and institutional factors which constrain communities to influence decisions which affect their livelihoods. It seems that the livelihood needs have not been considered
within the NHC arrangement. NHC regard the heritage site as a national asset, even though it is situated in an area where the livelihood priorities of the locals are considered vital for resource conservation. The elites in the conservancy are also acting in their own interest, by capturing the collective benefits that are meant for the community. This incident is not just unique to UTC, but is also noted in studies done by Pellis (2011) in the Anabeb conservancy and by Kashululu (2009) in the Uukwaluudhi conservancy. This is alluded to by Elliott & Sumba who stress that weak benefit sharing and the risk of elite capture of benefits, can mean that anticipated livelihoods impacts and conservation gain will remain unrealized (Elliot & Sumba, 2011). It is therefore essential that policies are supportive of the poor and should circumvent all loopholes which can be used by elites to capture benefits.

Although tourism is an important mechanism of conservation and rural development in the conservancy, actors do not always understand each other’s perspectives. As Ashley noted “just like local residents are unfamiliar with the commercial pressure of a tourism company, community members concerns can appear irrational to tourism operators whose whole livelihood depends on a single salary” (Ashley, 2000; p 29). It is therefore important that policies are explicit and that benefits between local communities and all stakeholders are clearly outlined, understood and taken into consideration, for the intended outcome of all actors to be realized. It is therefore imperative for the government to harmonize the NHC policy arrangement with the conservancy policy, especially where the operations of NHC is extending over conservancy land. This however, is an indication that the policy making is an ongoing process of negotiation, construction and deconstruction (Liefferink, 2006).

5.4 Recommendations
Since both policy arrangements are enacted by the government, the issue of benefit sharing between the NHC and the local community should be handled from a government level, as the power relations of the NHC and the UTC differ. The NHC is operating on national level while the UTC is operating on regional and local level hence, the conservancy has no authority to address NHC, or solve this issue on the local level. The two arrangements should be resolved through policy harmonization, for them to achieve their intended outcomes without affecting the local community. This will enhance the internal congruency of both arrangements in the conservancy. The UTC community is an important stakeholder that is closer to the TWHS with regard to the preservation thereof, benefit sharing will therefore aid in securing the assistance of the community in the preservation of the national heritage site. This will also foster cooperation which is so much needed for the collective management of resources in the conservancy.
To address the problem of misunderstanding and controversy between NHC and the community members, NHC should invest a lot of effort in the constant sensitization and the mobilization of the local community. It can use the annual general meetings as a platform to mobilize the local community and to inform the general community concerning new developments at the heritage site. The AGM should also be used as a platform where managers of tourism enterprises and the management of the NHC are seen and heard by the community. Furthermore, actors should use these platforms to inform and correct any misunderstandings that might prevail concerning them with the community. It is important for the presence of local actors to be noticed by community members as it portrays a sign of interest and can promote participation and cooperation.

Concerning the lack of institutional communication, actors should use the joint venture meetings, and the joint management meetings to address matters of mutual concern and strive to resolve problems amicably through dialogue. In order to solve the problem of representation in these meetings, the chairing of these meetings should rotate among the managers or actors represented in these meetings. It is of utmost importance to communicate what transpires in these meetings to the rest of the community, since managers are having more information concerning issues which need the attention of local members, however, not all the information is reaching the people on the ground. These actions can create a gap in knowledge between the community and the leaders and the community is at times in the dark regarding issues that they ought to know and erroneously make their own conclusions about the cause of events in the conservancy. NHC should also keep the CMC and the tourism operators constantly informed about changes and developments concerning the heritage site. The joint management meetings should be held according to the agreed time frame to facilitate the interactive communication channels among actors in the conservancy.

To solve the issue of participation, it is important for NHC to create a level where the CMC have some input in decisions, especially those that affect the conservancy member’s interest. Having the CMC in the joint management meetings to resolve conflict concerning employed conservancy members cannot be regarded as participation. However, NHC should create clear levels of community participation, for conservancy members not to feel alienated from the heritage site. The NHC should source the Kiosk and the crafts shop at the site to the conservancy office and not to the guides association. This can serve as an income generating process for the conservancy office and the gesture will also go a long way in improving relations between the conservancy and the NHC concerning access to resources, and ease the tension between the NHC and the conservancy. The guides association is an association consisting of
conservancy members and nonmembers and they should therefore not be seen as representing the conservancy members, as is the case with the NHC.

Another issue to be addressed is the conservancy leaseholds which are still in the possessions of private individuals. The conservancy pioneers still wield a lot of power in the conservancy and the position they have in society as figures of authority and as the pioneers of the UTC, put the CMC in a difficult position to confront the UTC pioneers. MET, WWF, NACSO and the legal assistance center branch which represent conservancies concerning legal issues should act on behalf of the conservancy.

There are inherent power relations among some actors that obstruct the realization of aspects such as participation, benefit sharing and access to resources in the conservancy. Although these inherent powers are not visible in the formal rules, they are felt in practice and powerful actors like the UTC pioneers and the NHC can tacitly deny the less powerful actors access to resources in the conservancy. It is therefore important that the formal and informal rules empower the ‘weaker actors’ for them to have some leverage in the policy domain.

With regard to livelihoods, the local and private tourism operators should also strive to invest more on the collective level, than only on the individual level of members, as most of their employees are not from the conservancy. It is also important that the partnership between the tourism investors and the locals should not merely be based on financial gain, but should include social aspects, mutual respect and good governance to sustain the entire conservancy program for the benefit of all parties.

In conclusion, the signing of contracts between the CMC and the private investors usually marks the beginning of a formal relationship between the two partners. However, once contracts have been signed and leaseholds obtained, many operators circumvent conservancies and seek to meet only the minimum standard of involvement, arguing that employment opportunities constitute enough as a benefit for the local community, while some lodge managers regards cash benefits paid out to the locals as money wasted by conservancy members. This is based on the different worldviews and perspectives between tourism operators and the local community. In order to change these paradigms, it is necessary to promote good levels of mutual understanding and to nurture respect and trust among all actors; this however, requires time, effort and a proactive approach to enable a long-term growth of effective partnership.
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APPENDICES

Appendix I
INTERVIEW GUIDE 1

Key informants: NHC, MET, NACSO, NGOs, Private and local Tourism operators Tertiary institutions, Conservancy committee members,

A) Which people or organizations are involved in the management of the TWHS? How and to what extend do they work with each other and the local community?

1) Who are the people or organizations involved in the management of the heritage site in the conservancy? And why are they involved?
2) Can other people or organizations become members in managing the site and what are the criteria’s?
3) How do you interact with the different stakeholders?
4) How do you ensure that the voices of all stakeholders including the local people are heard and their suggestions taken in to account through your means of interaction?
5) How do you describe the relations between your institution, the different operators and the local conservancy community?
6) How do you ensure that your relationship is sustained or improved?

B) What are the similarities and differences between the two policies in terms of rules of the game, actors involved, resources and existing discourses?

1) How was the heritage site managed before the Heritage Act was implemented?
2) How is the NHC operating on conservancy land?
3) What has changed regarding the management of the heritage site since the implementation of the Heritage Act?
4) What new rules/laws developed as a result of the Heritage Act? And if, how does these new rules benefit the stakeholders?
5) What are the main resources found in the Conservancy and who owns them?
6) How are the resources shared among the stakeholders in the Conservancy
7) What new resources have developed in the Conservancy as a result of TWHS

Livelihoods

1. A) How are people making a living in the Conservancy? How and to what extend is the NHC, the Conservancy office and the different private tourism operators helping the local conservancy members to complement the way people are trying to make a living?

1) How do the local people make a living in the conservancy?
2) How is the new status of Twyfelfontein as a world heritage site, improving the ways the local community is making a living?
3) What actual benefits are the locals getting from the tourism activities in the Conservancy?
   a. How are these benefits shared among the local community members?
   b. How are these benefits used in improving the ways locals makes a living
   c. Did the benefits which accrued from tourism resulted in other businesses opening in the conservancy and how are these businesses helping or improving the local community in making a living?
4) Besides employment and salaries in what other ways are the different organizations in the conservancy improving the livelihoods of the local community?

INTERVIEW GUIDE 2

General conservancy members:

3. How are people making a living in the conservancy and how is the NHC the Conservancy office and the tourism operators helping the local people to improve their ways of making a living?

1) How are you making a living in the conservancy?
2) How is the presence of NHC, the declaration of the area as a conservancy and the tourism operator’s presence in the conservancy improved (or not) the ways you are making a living?
3) What actual benefits are you getting from the conservancy, the NHC and the tourism operators who are all operating in the conservancy?
   a) How are these benefits shared among the local community members?
   b) How are these benefits used in improving the ways how the community make a living?
c) Did the benefits which accrued from tourism resulted in other businesses opening in the
conservancy and how are these businesses helping or improving the community in making a
living?

2. What will you describe as your possessions as conservancy members, and how are the operators
in the conservancy helping (or not) you, to look after these possessions?

3. What do you want to see changed by the conservancy office, NHC and the tourism operators in
improving the ways you are making a living?

Employed conservancy members:

1) How were you making a living before you started working here?

2) How have your living conditions changed when you started working and how is it right now?

3) How has the new status of Twyfelfontein as a world heritage site changed (or not) the way
you are making a living, and what positive benefits has it for the local community as well?

4) Besides the salary how else are you benefiting from this organization, and how is the local
conservancy members benefiting from this organization?

5) How are you and the conservancy members using the benefits that you are getting here to
improve the ways you are making a living?

6) Can you describe the relationship between you and your employer?

7) What changes do you want to see brought by your employer which can improve the way
you are making a living and the local conservancy members as well?

8) Are you having any other thing that you want to add?

Thank you for your time.