



# THE SUCCESS AND SUSTAINABILITY OF COMMUNITY-BASED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN THE OKAVANGO DELTA, BOTSWANA

J.E. MBAIWA

---

## ABSTRACT

This paper assesses the success and sustainability of Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) in the Okavango Delta. It does so by asking the following questions: a) to what extent has CBNRM contributed to sustainable natural resource use, rural economic development, enhanced rural livelihoods and benefit sharing? b) To what extent has power been devolved to the rural communities especially in relation to resource ownership and management? c) What are the existing and potential challenges facing the successful implementation of CBNRM in the Okavango Delta? With illustrations from the three CBNRM projects of Okavango Community Trust, Okavango Kopano Mokoro Community Trust and the Khwai Development Trust, this paper notes that local communities have successfully established community trusts as institutions to provide leadership in their participation in tourism and natural resource management. They also derive socio-economic benefits from CBNRM such as the participation in decision-making, employment and income generation. However, the lack of entrepreneurships and managerial skills, understanding of the concept of CBNRM, poor benefit sharing on CBNRM participants, and enclave tourism are some of the challenges that face CBNRM in the Okavango Delta. In the event that empowerment issues especially training and capacity building are successfully addressed, CBNRM in the Okavango Delta has the potential to be a successful model of community-based tourism

---

### Introduction

From the 1980s, community development and natural resource management have become intertwined. Twyman (2000) notes that in the present era, participatory and community based approaches are heralded as the panacea to natural resource management initiatives world-wide. In East and Southern Africa, Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) has been adopted as an approach that aims at achieving rural economic development and natural resource management. After almost 10 years of its implementation in Botswana, and in the Okavango Delta in particular, its success and sustainability is not adequately known.

This paper sets out to assess the success and sustainability of CBNRM in the Okavango Delta. As examples, it uses the three CBNRM projects of Okavango Community Trust (OCT), Okavango Kopano Mokoro Community Trust (OKMCT), and the Khwai Development Trust (KDT). The paper asks the following questions: a) What are the benefits that accrue to local communities from CBNRM in the Okavango Delta? b) How are the benefits shared and distributed? c) To what extent has power been devolved to the rural communities especially in relation to access, resource ownership and management? d) What is the role of CBNRM in promoting a sustainable tourism industry in the face of the current enclave tourism in the Okavango? e) What are the existing and potential challenges that face CBNRM in the Okavango Delta? Answers to these questions should provide information that should determine whether CBNRM in the Okavango is successfully and sustainably.

The success and sustainability of CBNRM in the Okavango Delta is discussed based on the concept of sustainable development. This concept is anchored on three broad concerns, namely: economic efficiency, social equity and ecological sustainability (WCED, 1987). Economic efficiency aims at the optimal use of natural resources (Serageldin, 1993; Munasinghe and McNeely, 1995). The aim is to produce the maximum output in order to achieve a high standard of living of the people within the constraints of the existing capital (Markandya, 1993; Paehlke, 1999). Therefore, economic efficiency should explain how the issues of economic benefits are shared not only among CBNRM members but also within the tourism industry as a whole in the Okavango Delta. Social equity, advocates fairness and equal access to resources by all user groups. This is aimed at ensuring equity in the distribution of costs, benefits, decision-making and management, which in theory will eradicate poverty (UNCED, 1992). In the case of CBNRM in the Okavango Delta, social equity refers to a situation

where all individuals in a community having the same opportunity to be actively involved in, benefit from, to make decisions about, and to manage natural resources. The sustainability of CBNRM projects is founded on the notion of equity within the community. That is, the opportunity to benefit from CBNRM should be the same for all community members irrespective of their ethnic background, gender, age or economic status. This paper should therefore establish whether some groups or members of society are being marginalized from the CBNRM process or from natural resources that have sustained their livelihoods for centuries.

Ecological sustainability emphasises that the rate of renewable natural resource use should not be faster than the rate at which the natural process renews itself (Serageldine, 1993). This is based on the assumption that the dynamic processes of the natural environment can become unsustainable as a result of stresses imposed by human activity (Munasinghe and McNeely, 1995). Ecological sustainability therefore refers to maintaining a system's stability, which implies limiting the stress on ecosystems central to the sustainability of the global system (Perrings, 1991). In this paper, ecological sustainability should provide an indication of whether CBNRM is achieving its goal of natural resource conservation in the Okavango Delta. The three concerns of economic, social, and ecological sustainability are inter-related. Impacts on one are likely to affect all others. For example, the failure to meet socio-economic needs of stakeholders, particularly local communities, in tourism development is likely to negatively affect the ecological sustainability of the Okavango Delta.

The paper begins by discussing the literature on the adoption of CBNRM in East and Southern Africa. A brief description of the study area and methodology used in the study are made in the next section. The main body of the paper discusses the success and sustainability of CBNRM in the Okavango Delta using the three CBNRM projects of Okavango Community Trust (OCT), Okavango Kopano Mokoro Community Trust (OKMCT) and the Khwai Development Trust (KDT) as examples. The last section concludes the paper.

### Background to community-based natural resource management

The driving force behind the introduction of Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) in East and Southern Africa from the 1980s was a result of factors such as: the threat of species extinction due to over utilisation of resources especially wildlife through poaching, the inability of the state to protect its declining wildlife resources, land use conflicts between

rural communities living in resource areas and resource managers especially wildlife managers and the need to link conservation and development (Steiner and Rihoy, 1995). These factors resulted in the adoption of CBNRM as an alternative strategy of natural resource management. Mbanefo and de Boerr (1993) state that local involvement in natural resource use and management has been successfully implemented in Zimbabwe since 1986 through the Communal Area Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE). Ashley (1995) claims that local involvement in natural resource management is being implemented through the Living in a Finite Environment (LIFE) programme in Namibia. In Mozambique, it is accomplished successfully through Tchuma Tchato 'Our Wealth' (Cruz, 1995), in Kenya through the Conservation of Biodiversity Resource Areas Programme (COBRA) (Masika, 1995), and in Tanzania through the Ujirani Mwena 'Good Neighbourliness'. In Botswana, Thakadu (1997); Mbaiwa (1999); Mvimi (2000); Twyman (2000) and Taylor (2000) state that the involvement of communities in resource management is carried out through the Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) programme.

The CBNRM approach combines rural development and natural resource conservation (Rozemeijer and van der Jagt, 2000). It is a reform of the conventional 'protectionist conservation philosophy' and 'top down' approaches to development, and it is based on common property theory which discourages open access resource management, and promotes resource use rights of the local communities (Rihoy, 1995). As an attempt to find new solutions for the failure of top-down approaches to development and conservation, CBNRM is based on the recognition that local people must have power to decide over their natural resources in order to encourage sustainable development (Rozemeijer and van der Jagt, 2000). CBNRM aims at alleviating rural poverty and advance conservation by strengthening rural economies and empowering communities to manage resources for their long-term social, economic and ecological benefits (Rozemeijer and van der Jagt, 2000). The CBNRM programme is perceived to be a hybrid of the modern system of development and the indigenous knowledge systems (Kgathi *et al.*, 2002). For instance, the ADMADDE programme of the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Services in Zambia is seen as restoration of the resource use rights for wildlife resources to the local communities through their traditional institutions and leaders (Mwenya *et al.*, 1990). This idea is consistent with the view held by George and Dei (1995: 149) that many societies are experiencing "a renewal and revitalization of indigenous knowledge systems and traditions for social development and co-existence with nature".

The adoption of CBNRM programmes is based on the premise that local populations have a greater interest in the sustainable use of natural resources around them more than centralised or distant government or private management institutions (Tsing *et al.*, 1999; Twyman, 2000). CBNRM credits the local people with having a greater understanding of, as well as vested interest in, their local environment hence they are seen as more able to effectively manage natural resources through local or traditional practices (Leach *et al.*, 1999; Tsing *et al.*, 1999; Twyman, 2000). CBNRM assumes that once rural communities participate in natural resource utilisation and derive economic benefits, this will cultivate the spirit of ownership and will ultimately lead them to use natural resources found around them sustainably (Mbaiwa, 1999).

Although CBNRM is generally accepted as an alternative model of fostering the sustainable use of natural resources through community development, critics of the model note the following weaknesses about it: the lack of a clear criteria by which to conclude whether CBNRM projects are sustainable and successful in meeting conservation and development targets (Western *et al.*, 1994; Boggs, 2002); marginalisation of minority groups (Taylor 2000, 2001); inaccurate assumptions about communities and poorly conceived focus on community level organization (Agrawal and Gibson, 1999); and inappropriate management strategies (Fortman *et al.*, 2001). Critics also note that there is a tendency

by 'policy receivers' who are the intended beneficiaries to be treated passively by 'policy givers' (Twyman, 1998, 2000); and that CBNRM projects heavily rely on expatriate expertise (Pimbert and Pretty, 1995; Twyman, 2000). Much of the literature on CBNRM is falsely optimistic and high expectations have not been achieved, as a result, in Southern Africa villages are largely not benefiting from CBNRM. The devolution of rights to communities is noted by Lawry (1994) to be insufficient without equal attention to how rights are distributed. The issue of devolution of rights is related to the weak understanding of institutional arrangements impeding on CBNRM (Leach *et al.*, 1999). Twyman (1998) and Taylor (2000, 2001) argue that CBNRM projects in the Central Kalahari, Mababe and Khwai in Botswana give the illusion of access to resources but neglect the ability of communities to exercise effective command over them. Arguments for and against CBNRM indicate that much is still not known about the success and sustainability of the CBNRM programme in East and Southern Africa.

In Botswana, two key policies laid the foundation of CBNRM projects. These include the Wildlife Conservation Policy of 1986 and the Tourism Policy of 1990 (Thakadu, 1997; Mbaiwa, 1999; Rozemeijer and van der Jagt, 2000). The policies call for increased opportunities for local communities to benefit from wildlife and natural resources through tourism development (Rozemeijer and van der Jagt, 2000). From the 1990s, several CBNRM projects were established in Botswana, starting with the Chobe Enclave Conservation Trust in 1993 in the Chobe region (Thakadu, 1997; Mvimi, 2000). The second CBNRM project and the first in the Okavango was the Sankuyo Tshwaragano Management Trust (STMT) established in 1995 (Mbaiwa, 1999). Ever since then, many more CBNRM projects have been established. By 2001, there were 45 CBNRM projects operating in Botswana of which 12 or 27% are in the Okavango (National CBNRM Forum, 2001). Despite the increase of CBNRM projects in Botswana, the success and sustainability of the programme largely remain debatably not only in Botswana but in most parts of East and Southern Africa.

### Study area

This study was carried out in the Okavango Delta located in northwestern Botswana. The villages of Seronga, Khwai and Ditshiping were chosen for purposes of illustration. These villages are respectively part of the three CBNRM projects of the Okavango Community Trust (OCT), Okavango Kopano Mokoro Community Trust (OKMCT) and the Khwai Development Trust (KDT). The Okavango Delta, a wetland of international importance and a Ramsar site is a rich wildlife habitat and home to 5, 000 insects, 3, 000 plants, 540 birds, 164 mammals, 157 reptiles, 80 fish and countless micro-organisms (Rothert, 1997). Because of its rich wildlife diversity and scenic beauty, the Okavango has in the last 10-15 years become one of the leading tourism destinations in Botswana (Mbaiwa, 2002). The Okavango is also home to over 124,000 people (CSO, 2002). The composition of the human population in the Okavango can broadly be classified into two groups, the Bantu-speaking people and the Basarwa or people of Khoisan descent.

The Okavango Community Trust (OCT), Okavango Kopano Mokoro Community Trust (OKMCT) and the Khwai Development Trust (KDT) are part of the 12 CBNRM projects found in the Okavango Delta. As already noted, from the OCT, the village of Seronga was selected, Ditshiping was chosen from OKMCT while KDT is composed of Khwai, which was selected for the study. Seronga is located in the northern upper part of the Okavango River and Delta otherwise known as the panhandle. Ditshiping and Khwai are located on the lower parts of the Delta with Khwai on the southeast and Ditshiping on the southwest. The selection of this study sites is therefore considered representative in terms of location and of the various ethnic groups found in the Okavango.

### Methodology

Data collection for this paper was carried out between January and April 2001. It was updated in August 2002. Both primary and secondary data sources were used. Secondary sources involved

the use of both published and unpublished reports, journals articles and books on tourism and CBNRM in Botswana and the Okavango Delta in particular. Primary data collection involved the administration of structured and unstructured questionnaires as well as informal interviews with CBNRM project leaders in the villages of Khwai, Seronga and Ditshiping. It also involved informal interviews with government officials at the Departments of Tourism, Wildlife and National Parks and the Tawana Land Board. Focused group discussions were conducted with CBNRM leaders in each of the three villages of Seronga, Ditshiping and Khwai.

A total of 124 household representatives were interviewed of which 31 were from Khwai, 32 from Ditshiping and 61 from Seronga. The total households in the three villages are respectively estimated to be 40 for both Khwai and Dishiping and 80 for Seronga. The head of the household or a spouse was the respondent. In cases where the head of the household or spouse were absent, a family representative who was over 18 years of age became the respondent. The households were interviewed because with interviews, the question of literacy does not matter. Most rural populations of Botswana are unable to read and write but understand Setswana, the language used for interviewing. Government officials interviewed were not necessarily sampled as specific individuals dealing with tourism and CBNRM were chosen to give an official version of CBNRM in the area.

Sampling of the three villages of Seronga, Khwai and Disthiping were respectively based on the following reasons: Khwai is involved in CBNRM without partnering with any village. It is the only village in the Okavango that has adopted a different model from the one proposed by government, and that it is composed of the Basarwa or so-called "Bushman" who are one of the minority and disadvantaged group in Botswana; Ditshiping was selected mainly because it is part of the OKMCT and dominated by Bayei who are a Bantu-speaking group and located on the lower parts of the Delta; and Seronga is also composed of Bantu-speaking groups of which the Bambukushu and Bayei are dominant groups in the village. Seronga is located on the upper part of the Okavango Delta.

### **Socio-political benefits of CBNRM**

(a) The decentralisation of land and its resources to rural communities

Access to and control over natural resources by local communities involved in CBNRM projects has become the catchphrase in community-based natural resource management. In the Okavango Delta, access and control of resources by rural communities is carried out through the decentralisation of land and its resources to rural communities. This has so far been achieved through the adoption and implementation of several government policies and strategies such as the Wildlife Conservation Policy of 1986, Tourism Policy of 1990, National Conservation Strategy of 1990, Tourism Act of 1992 and the Wildlife Conservation and National Parks Act of 1992 which laid the foundation for CBNRM in Botswana (Rozemeijer and van der Jagt, 2000). According to Rozemeijer and van der Jagt, each of these documents call for increased opportunities for local communities to benefit from wildlife and natural resources through tourism development. These government documents should therefore be seen as having played an important role in facilitating the decentralisation of land and its resources to rural communities for tourism purposes.

The Wildlife Conservation Policy of 1986 proposed the division of all the nine districts in the country into Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs). The concept of WMAs in Botswana arose from the need for conservation and controlled utilisation of wildlife outside national parks and game reserves, along with the desirability of creating buffer zones between protected areas and human settlements. WMAs are therefore zones between protected areas and surrounding areas especially human settlements. The primary land use option in WMAs is wildlife utilisation and management, other types of land use are permitted provided they do not prejudice

the wildlife population and their utilisation (Thakadu, 1997; Mbaiwa, 1999). WMAs were further sub-divided into Controlled Hunting Areas (CHAs) which become the "unit of production" (Rozemeijer and van der Jagt, 2000). As a result, CHAs are administrative blocks used by DWNP to allocate wildlife quotas (Rozemeijer and van der Jagt, 2000). Botswana is divided into 163 CHAs which are zoned for various types of wildlife utilisation (both consumptive and non-consumptive uses), under commercial or community management. In communal areas, CHAs are zoned around existing settlements and those under community management are designed to benefit the local people (Rozemeijer and van der Jagt, 2000).

The Okavango area is sub-divided into 28 WMAs and 49 CHAs. WMAs and CHAs differ in terms of size. By 2001, a total of 12 CHAs were already allocated to the different communities in the Okavango for tourism purposes, 15 CHAs were leased to safari companies by the Tawana Land Board for both hunting and photographic purposes. The rest of the CHAs are used for multipurpose activities and are under the control of Tawana Land Board. The OCT is allocated NG 22 and 23 which cover a land surface area of 928 square kilometers, OKMCT is allocated NG 32 which covers 1,225 square kilometers while KDT has been allocated NG 18 and 19 and cover 1,918 square kilometers.

Although wildlife and related tourism policies in Botswana give part of the responsibility for managing and administering wildlife resources, Rozemeijer and van der Jagt (2000) note that they fail to define the objective of government in relation to CBNRM nor do they provide firm guidance for its implementation. Mbaiwa (2002) also notes that although local people are given partial rights to manage land and wildlife resources in the Okavango, much of it remain centralised as land is only leased to them for a 15 year period and wildlife resources wholly remain the property of government except the quota allocated to the community. Cassidy (2001) states that there is very little natural resource monitoring undertaken, and few management decisions made, by rural communities. Final decisions over key resources remain the responsibility of government; for example, the hunting quotas are determined by the Department of Wildlife and National Parks without the involvement of the rural communities. Despite these limitations, it is important to note that government policies and the zoning of the country into WMAs and CHAs for CBNRM purposes indicates the success of the project. Rozemeijer et al. (2000: 7) notes that key achievements made by CBNRM in Botswana include the fact: a) the Department of Wildlife and National Parks has laid down comprehensive legislation and implementation guidelines in support of CBNRM in the country; and that b) a nationwide land use zoning exercise has realigned the boundaries of wildlife (hunting) and other natural resource areas to conform to major land use zones and create economically and ecologically viable land units.

(b) The local natural resource institutional framework  
*Community-based organisation or trust (OCT, KDT and OKMCT)*

Access to and management of natural resources and participation in tourism by rural communities is carried out through local institutions known as Community-Based Organisations (CBOs) or trusts. The Okavango Community Trust (OCT), Okavango Kopano Mokoro Community Trust (OKMCT) and the Khwai Development Trust (KDT) are some of the local institutions or trusts in the study area. Community-Based Trusts are a prerequisite for communities to be allocated a Controlled Hunting Area (CHA) and a wildlife quota by the Department of Wildlife and National Parks (Mbaiwa, 2002, 2003). Community trusts as local institutions provide leadership in the use of land and resources such as wildlife for tourism purposes by participating communities. In 2001, there were 12 CBNRM projects in the Okavango Delta, that is, about 27% of all CBNRM projects in Botswana (National CBNRM Forum, 2001). The Okavango Community Trust (OCT) in Seronga was the first to be registered in March 1995, followed by Sankuyo Tshwaragano Management Trust (STMT) in Sankuyo in November 1995 (National CBNRM

Forum, 2001). Despite the fact that Khwai was one of the first villages to be encouraged to participate in the CBNRM programme, it was amongst the last villages in the Okavango to implement it (Taylor, 2001; Mbaiwa, 2002). This is mainly because they wanted a concession for Basarwa only, an idea which the Government did not accept as such a concession would exclude other ethnic groups within the village, this delayed the registration of the trust (Taylor, 2000; Mbaiwa, 2002).

Guided by their constitutions and management plans, the KDT, OCT and OKMCT have become *de facto* owners of the wildlife resources in their respective community areas (Rozeimejer and van der Jagt, 2000). The OCT and OKMCT are engaged in tourism activities such as sub-leasing their CHAs and selling of their wildlife quotas to safari companies, managing of cultural tourism, marketing of baskets and crafts, photographic tourism, and marketing of reeds and grass (National CBNRM Forum, 2001). The KDT also carries out the mentioned tourism activities except for sub-leasing of community area and selling of the wildlife quota.

#### *Membership of the OCT, OKMCT and the KDT*

In the OCT, OKMCT and KDT, there is an automatic general membership to all local people over 18 years of age and have resided in respective villages for at least five years (Mbaiwa, 2002). The inclusion of all people with 18 years as members of trusts and eligible for participation in decision making in tourism and natural resource management shows the extent at which power has been decentralization. This is inline with the concept of sustainable development which emphasises involvement of stakeholders particularly the rural people in decisions that concerns their lives (WCED, 1987). The *kgosi* (village chief) and the Village Development Committee (VDC) members are ex-officio members in CBNRM project committees such as VTCs and Board of Trustees (Mbaiwa, 2002, 2003). The *Kgosi* is the traditional head of a village and in carrying out developments projects in his/her village, he/she is assisted by the VDC. The inclusion of the *kgosi* and the VDC in the Board of Trustees and VTCs as ex-officio members gives CBOs credibility and legal support from village authorities or traditional leadership (Mbaiwa, 2003). The involvement of traditional institutions such as the VDC and traditional leaders such as the *kgosi* in tourism development in the Okavango Delta provides planners with the opportunity to assess how the scientific and indigenous knowledge can be fused together and promote sustainability in natural resource management.

#### *The structure and governance of the OCT, KDT and OKMCT*

The structure of both the KDT, OCT and the OKMCT is based on a legal arrangement created through a Deed of Trust in which trustees are bound to use resources provided by the benefactor to assist beneficiaries. These community trusts apply for a head lease over their CHA from the Land Board (Mbaiwa, 2002). The tenure of a community head lease for a CHA is 15 years, and it is renewable after every five years (Gujadhur, 2000, 2001). As a result, the lease empowers trusts to sign sub-leases with the private sector, according to the conditions stipulated in the head lease (DWNP, 1999). A wildlife head lease, for example, may permit hunting, game capture and/or tourism related activities depending on whether the community area is zoned for multipurpose use, where either both hunting and photographic activities are allowed or when they are carried out separately.

The operations of the OCT, OKMCT and KDT are guided by constitutions which specify, *inter alia*, the memberships and duties of the trusts, powers of the boards of trustees and VTCs (where applicable), nature of meetings, and resource governance and sanctions of the trusts (DWNP, 1999; Monthe, Marumo and Co., 1995). The constitutions detail how decision-making and benefit distribution should be carried out (Cassidy, 2000). The constitutions give the power of decision-making to the general membership, whereas others give such power to the Board of Trustees which takes decisions on behalf of the general membership (Mbaiwa, 2002).

The Board of Trustees is considered the supreme governing body in each CBNRM project (Mbaiwa 2003). Community trusts that comprise one village such as the KDT have Board of Trustees only, while those that comprise more than one village such as the OCT and OKMCT have both a VTC and the Board of Trustees (Mbaiwa, 2002). The OCT and OKMCT villages respectively chose 12 people who are elected during the Annual General Meeting to form the Village Trust Committee (Mbaiwa, 2002). For Seronga and Ditshiping, two members from their VTC are then selected to represent the village and VTC in the Board of Trustees (Mbaiwa, 2002). Members of Village Trust Committees (VTC) and Board of Trustees are elected at a *kgotla* meeting every two years (Kgathi *et al.* 2002). The use of *kgotla* for general meetings where major decisions regarding community-based tourism are taken is important in that the *kgotla* is the authentic meeting place in rural areas of Botswana. It is the traditional village square where local people gather and are free to express their views; this is a "traditional parliament" in every village in Botswana (Mbaiwa, 2002).

The Board of Trustees is the supreme body to which all the VTCs in each village report (DWNP, 1999). They conduct and manage all the affairs of the community trusts on behalf of its members. These affairs include signing of legal documents such as leases and contracts with safari companies, and maintaining a close contact with the trust lawyers. It also keeps trust records, financial accounts and reports, and presents them to the general membership at the annual general meetings (Mbaiwa, 2002). As a result of its important role in resource management, the Board of Trustees is a focal point for important decision-making regarding quotas and benefit distribution, business deals with the private sector, and agreements with support agencies such as donors and non-governmental organisations (Rozeimejer and van der Jagt, 2000).

#### *Functions of OCT, KDT and OKMCT*

In the CBNRM villages of Seronga, Khwai and Ditshiping, community trusts have become an important village institution. They are regarded as representatives of the interests of their constituents especially in resource use and management in the Okavango Delta. Rozeimejer and van der Jagt (2000) note that trusts are increasingly recognised by the Government and other agencies as partners in rural development, who can take up planning and management responsibilities. As a result, the main function of community trusts in the Okavango is to ensure that their respective communities participate and benefit from consumptive and non-consumptive wildlife-based tourism activities (Mbaiwa, 2002). They are, therefore, expected to satisfy the Government that they are accountable and representative, able to obtain head leases for giving them tenure of access, use resources efficiently, issue sub-leases to joint venture partners, sign contracts with the private sector, and raise funds from the donor community.

The establishment of trusts should be considered to be one of the successes of the CBNRM programme in Botswana. The establishment of trusts among other issues indicates an organized institutional arrangement aimed at involving local people in resource management and tourism development in the Okavango. This is in line with the ideals of sustainable development which stress that all people should be involved in any socio-economic and political development that affects their lives (WCED, 1987).

In addition to the above achievements of CBNRM, Rozemeijer *et al.* (2000: 7) note that the fact that an association of CBNRM, known as Botswana Community Based Organisation Network (BOCOBONET) has been established to take up important mediating and advocating role in representing the interest of the sector is a great achievement in CBNRM development. Mbaiwa (2002) also notes that the National CBNRM Forum and the Ngamiland/Okavango CBNRM Forum have been established since 2001 with aims of providing an opportunity for stakeholders (e.g. community trusts, safari operators, and government) to discuss issues of common interests that affect CBNRM particularly the joint venture partnership, capacity building and policy related issues.

## The socio-economic benefits from CBNRM projects

### (a) Revenue generation and employment creation

Because of the joint venture agreements, CBNRM projects in the Okavango have benefited in terms of financial benefits, employment, meat and other intangible benefits from CBNRM projects. As shown in Table 1, in 2001, the OCT obtained P1.5 million (US\$ 250,000) and OKMCT got P 1.1 million (US\$ 183,333) as revenue generated from land rentals and the sale of wildlife quotas to safari companies. The KDT does not sub-lease their land to safari operators and they sell their wildlife quota at an auction sale. In 2001, they got P 550,000 (US\$ 91,667) which was almost half of what they got the previous year. The OCT and OKMCT have followed the Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP) model of implementing CBNRM projects. This includes the promotion of joint venture partnership with safari operators (DWNP, 1999). However, the KDT decided on a different model where they do not form a joint venture partnership with safari operators but prefer selling their wildlife quota at an auction sale and do not sub-lease their land (Mbaiwa, 1999, 2002). In terms of raw income, CBNRM has been widely successful in the Okavango. In 2001, CBNRM generated an estimated 4.8 million pula (about US\$ 800,000) into the Okavango community-based organisations through contracts and joint venture partnerships with safari operators, sale of hunting quotas, crafts and veld products, and small-scale tourism ventures (North West CBNRM Forum, 2001).

are offered as entertainment to tourists at campsites and at the lodge. The OPT provides employment for 100 people of which 75 are polers while the remainder are boat drivers, cooks, waiters, office attendants, co-ordinators and a business manager (Mbaiwa, 2002). In 2001, it had 3,725 tourist clients and generated P625, 000 or US\$ 104,167 (Mbaiwa, 2002). Gudigwa village, which is part of the OCT and dominated by the Basarwa (Bushmen), has also formed its trust known as the Bakhakwe Community Conservation Trust (BCCT). The BCCT has so far built a lodge that offers traditional Basarwa (Bushmen) accommodation, dishes, craft, music and dance. It employs 15 local people and has 50 other informal workers who provide craft work, and the Basarwa music and dance (Molefe, 2003, pers. Comm.).

The considerable amount of revenue and employment opportunities that local communities realise from their involvement in community-based tourism reflects that initial intentions of CBNRM are being achieved. These include the involvement of local communities in resource management while at the same time making them derive direct socio-economic benefits from such resources. Income generation and employment opportunities for the rural people in CBNRM projects should be seen as one of the success areas of the programme in the Okavango Delta. CBNRM in the Okavango Delta has also had an effect of increasing the value of natural resources particularly wildlife. For example, in 2001, local people knew that an elephant sells at P 42,000

(US\$ 7, 000) to a safari operator (Mbaiwa, 2002). CBNRM has also increased the value of cultural resources especially the production of traditional crafts such as baskets and wood craving, and through traditional singing and dancing for the tourists. These activities are perceived as building a sense of pride and self-worth as well as preserving cultural identities (Cassidy, 2001). Rozemeijer et al. (2000: 7) notes that resource revenue/ land rentals have increased to better reflect the value of natural resources.

### Problems and challenges of CBNRM

The OCT, OKMCT, KDT and most of the CBNRM projects in the Okavango are constrained by factors such as lack of entrepreneurship and managerial skills in the tourism business, that is the lack of training and capacity building, insecurity of tenure, conflicts between stakeholders, management problems of community

trusts and misuse of funds (National CBNRM Forum, 2001). These problems affect the success and sustainability of CBNRM in the Okavango Delta.

#### (a) Lack of entrepreneurship and managerial skills

The Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP) (2000) notes that the OCT, OKMCT and the KDT lack business management skills as well as the necessary experience in developing viable tourism projects in their respective areas. The lack of entrepreneurship and managerial skills in the tourism business by local communities has led them to form joint partnerships with safari companies. Most joint ventures are in the form of contract agreements rather than community-private sector partnerships. The latter requires substantial management skills and trust between stakeholders. The joint venture partnership system in the Okavango Delta is very weak and it directly affects the successful performance of community-based projects (Mbaiwa, 2002). However, the joint venture partnership is assumed to be very important for the success of CBNRM projects (DWNP 1999; Gujadjhur, 2001). Communities which do not have knowledge about how to commercially utilise their natural resources, nor capital to do so, hence forming the

Table 1. Financial Benefits Accruing to Selected CBNRM projects in the Okavango Delta, 1997 - 2001

Name of Community Trust	Tourism Activity	Year	Rental (P)	Quota (P)	Others (P)	Total Revenue (P)*
Sankuyo Tshwaragano Management Trust	Hunting and photographic	1997	285 000		285 000	
		1998	345 000		345 000	
		1999	140 000	202 850	120 000	462 000
		2000	154 000	223 135	148 940	526 075
		2001	169 400	245 450	180 610	595 460
Okavango Community Trust	Hunting and photographic	1997	264 000	204 050		468 050
		1998	290 400	335 250		625 650
		1999	319 440	332 900		652 340
		2000	350 240	336 000		686 240
		2001	600 000	400 000	500 000	1 500 000
Cgaegae Tlhabololo Trust	Hunting and photographic	1998	40 750		30 000	70 750
		1999	70 000		35 000	105 000
		2000	25 000	290 167	27 095	342 262
		2001	265 000			265 000
Okavango Kopano Mokoro Community Trust	Hunting and photographic	1999	110 000	320 000	250 000	680 000
		2000	200 000	700 000	200 000	1 100 000
		2001	220 000	735 000	200 000	1 155 000
Mababe Zokotsama Development Trust	Hunting and photographic	2000	60 000	550 000	65 000	675 000
		2001	69 000	632 000	63 250	764 250
Khwai Development Trust	Hunting and photographic	2000		1 100 000		1 100 000
		2001		550 000		550 000

Source: Mbaiwa (2002) \*1.0 USD = 6.0 BWP in 2002

In terms of employment, in 2001, the OCT was employing 130 people, OKMCT employed 100 people while KDT employed 78 people. Employment opportunities for 832 people in all of the CBNRM projects in the Okavango were created for the rural community members in tourism facilities in 2001.

CBNRM projects in the Okavango particularly, the OCT, OKMCT and the KDT have also been able to spawn community-based tourism enterprises such as campgrounds, cultural tourism sites, guesthouses and craft outlets which also generate some revenue and create employment opportunities in rural villages. Within the OCT, a group of 75 canoe drivers (polers) at Seronga village have formed a trust known as the Okavango Poler's Trust (OPT). The OPT was formed with intentions of establishing a viable eco-tourism operation in the panhandle or upper Okavango River (Chadwick Anderson and Partners, 1998). The OPT does not have a CHA leased to it by government. It is involved in canoe (*mekoro*) safaris in the Okavango River, operates a camping site and a lodge to provide accommodation. Traditional dishes, dance and music depicting the Wayeyi (ethnic group in Seronga) culture

joint venture partnership is expected to fill the gaps and in the process transfer entrepreneurship and management skills to the local people (DWNP, 1999). This goal has not been successfully implemented at the OCT, OKMCT, KDT and in other CBNRM projects in the Okavango Delta. Gujadjhur (2001) and Rozemeijer and van der Jagt (2000) state that there is no transfer of skills between communities and safari operators in the development of community-based tourism. Gujadjhur (2001) states that even though there are communities with tourism operations plans, there is no example of real collaboration and learning between safari companies and communities. Therefore, what was intended as a true joint venture partnership through CBNRM has resulted in a management contract where communities have little to do with the management, monitoring or practicalities of running a tourism business. Instead of being managers or being in the forefront in the development of community-based tourism, most of the participating communities have become labourers and land lords who are aware that money will come regardless of participation or performance (Gujadjhur, 2001; Boggs, 2002). CBNRM has, therefore, created a system of passive participation, raised expectations and provided disincentives to work (Boggs, 2002).

The lack of entrepreneurship skills by local communities has also resulted in these funds to either be kept in the bank without being re-invested or have been misused or misappropriated. For example, DWNP (2000: 4) notes that with the OKMCT, there is an “apparent misappropriation of funds (P12, 500 or US\$ 2,083). The Village Technical Committee has been requested on a majority vote by the community present at the 2000 Annual General Meeting to call the Department of Economic Crime and Corruption to investigate the allegations”. In January 2001, the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Local Governments Mr E. Molale in a savingram raised the same issue when stating that there is poor handling and use of funds earned from CBNRM projects, failure to have audited reports on financial management and the misappropriation of CBNRM funds by some community trusts. As a result, the Permanent Secretary instructed that all funds earned from community-based projects should be management in trust by the District Councils instead of safari operators dealing directly with participating communities. However, this has not yet been implemented due to opposition by community trusts and the US Agency for international Development (UASID) which spearheaded the formation of trusts in the country (Kgathi *et al.*, 2002).

The lack of entrepreneurship and management skills in tourism can be attributed to the narrow CBNRM programme design and approach. CBNRM was primarily designed to achieve conservation, issues relating to social empowerment or economic development were largely ignored.

The intention of CBNRM has never been to give communities full ownership over land or resources but to provide them with an incentive to manage the land or natural resources. Economic benefits were, therefore, perceived as a means of achieving conservation as well as being an end in themselves (Gudjukur, 2001, Mbaiwa 2002). As a result of this approach, CBNRM in the Okavango is currently performing poorly due to lack of empowerment especially entrepreneurship skills in the tourism business by local communities. Land and wildlife resources in the Okavango remain centralised by the central government with communities given land user rights for only 15 years or are allocated wildlife quotas.

(b) Lack of understanding of the CBNRM concepts

The CBNRM concept in Botswana and Okavango in particular is relatively new and generally lacks understanding by the local communities (Mbaiwa, 2002). As a result community-based tourism is carried out with much of the support from the Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP) which mobilises communities to form CBOs and provides communities with most of the technical advice in joint venture partnership with safari operators. The dependence on DWNP in providing the direction in which community-based tourism should take is unsustainable

in that projects that rely on outside assistance are generally not fully independent and most likely to collapse once the outside assistance is withdrawn abruptly. In addition, Rozemeijer and van der Jagt (2000: 10) state that “DWNP does not have the resources for long-term facilitation and at times endorses the establishment of a trust with a quota knowing that it will not be able to provide the necessary follow-up, leaving behind a resource rich but institutionally puzzled community”.

The lack of understanding by the rural communities of the concept of CBNRM in the Okavango is further shown by the failure of communities to come up with tourist projects that match their skills and knowledge. For example, in an attempt to re-investment funds generated from land rentals or sale of wildlife quotas, some local communities are either proposing or are engaged on tourism projects that are too elaborate and complicated for them to understand and manage such as kiosk, bottle stores and guesthouses. These projects often fail and close down due to the lack of management and investment skills (Mbaiwa, 1999, 2002). These communities have also bought Land Cruiser vehicles which are used as free public transport system instead of being used for community tourism projects as initially planned. DWNP (2000) notes that villages in the OKMCT have no development plans as to how they are to use funds derived from CBNRM. This shows the lack of understanding by the rural communities on CBNRM issues.

(c) Poor distribution of CBNRM financial and employment benefits

The poor distribution of CBNRM financial and employment benefits threatens the critical issues affecting the sustainability of the programme in the Okavango Delta. In the Okavango, there is little or no financial, employment and food benefits that rural communities derive from CBNRM at a household level. For example, 52.1% of the households in the three villages of Ditshiping (OKMCT), Khwai (KDT) and Seronga (OCT) noted that they do not derive any benefits from CBNRM projects in their villages. The highest figures were at Ditshiping and Seronga where 78.1% and 50.9% of the households respectively said they derive no benefits from CBNRM projects. The rest of the respondents noted that they derive income, meat, and employment from the CBNRM project in their area.

Table 2. Responses on Household Benefits from CBNRM Projects

Villages	Income	Employment	Meat	Income, Meat & Employment	None	Totals
Ditshiping	2 (6.3%)	2 (6.3%)	1 (3.1%)	2 (6.3%)	25 (78.1%)	32 (100.0%)
Khwai	2 (6.7%)	7 (23.3%)	3 (10.0%)	10 (33.3%)	8 (26.7%)	30 (100.0%)
Seronga	1 (1.8%)	8 (14.5%)	2 (3.6%)	16 (29.1%)	28 (50.9%)	55 (100.0%)
Totals	5 (4.3%)	17 (14.5%)	6 (5.1%)	28 (23.9%)	61 (52.1%)	117 (100.0%)

At a community level, group discussions in Ditshiping attended by the Village Development Committee members and the Village Trust Committee and informal interviews with some community members further showed that the Ditshiping community does not benefit much from CBNRM or from the OKMCT (Mbaiwa, 2002). Communities noted that they do not derive expected benefits such as the use of trust vehicles, jobs, income and the community projects promised when joint venture partnerships with safari operators were made (Mbaiwa, 2002). It is not clear to most members of the community of Ditshiping whether they should benefit as individual households or as a community from their trust (Mbaiwa, 2002).

The Gudigwa community which is part of the OCT is also noted for not receiving a fair share of CBNRM benefits. For example, Taylor (2001) states that the Gudigwa community alleged that they were not receiving their fair share of the benefits accrued to the OCT from leasing out their land, such as jobs, meat, cash and the use of OCT vehicles. Taylor interprets the problem of lack of benefits by the Basarwa of Gudigwa from their CBO to ethnic differences with other five villages/members of the trusts that belong to a different ethnic background (mostly Basubiya). The Basarwa claim that their village is looked down upon by other

members of the trust because they are Basarwa (Taylor, 2001). They as a result prefer an independent trust and community wildlife area from the rest of the OCT. However, attempts to create 'Bushmen Only' trust by the people of Khwai were not accepted by government (Rozemeijer and van der Jagt, 2000).

The poor distribution of benefits from CBNRM projects is a result of factors such as: ethnic differences and internal conflicts between members of a trust, and poor co-ordination between the Village Technical Committees/Board of Trustees and the general membership (Mbaiwa, 2002). DWNP (2000) notes that in the OCT and OKMCT, there is poor communication between trusts board members and the wider community members. This has as a result led to lack of ownership of trusts by villagers or community members. For the OKMCT, DWNP (2000) further notes that the long distances between the six villages and the poor working relations between them has resulted in failure by communities to appreciate the trusts as theirs. This has resulted in Village Technical Committee/board members running trusts without much participation by other community members hence disparities in benefit sharing. For example, the rural elite and influential people in Village Technical Committees and Board of Trusts, are alleged to be paid high setting allowances (e.g. P500.00 or US\$ 83 at OCT in 2000) while the rest of the general members get nothing (Rozemeijer and van der Jagt, 2000). The OCT has also developed into a powerful village institution, and because of its power, Rozemeijer and van der Jagt (2000: 10) state that in the Seronga area or OCT, "the Board of Trustees starts to live a life of its own in very close harmony with the safari operator and, in the process, loses contact with its constituents". DWNP (2000) also notes that there is an apparent strong private sector and political influence over the OCT board activities and decisions. This has in the process excluded other members to meaningfully participate in the development of their trusts. This shows that in some communities, only the emerging elite who are at the helm of trusts management benefit from CBNRM while the majority of the community members derive little or no benefits from CBNRM. Molale (2001) also notes that only a few people benefit from these funds and yet they are meant to benefit larger sections of the community. However, the distribution of benefits is probably the most crucial component of CBNRM, and if not worked out in a sufficient detail, becomes a potential stumbling block for CBOs (Rozemeijer and van der Jagt, 2000).

In his savaingram Mr. Molale also raised the concerns that: a) there is a strong feeling that there shouldn't be a departure from the policy of natural resources benefiting the whole nation, as is done with diamonds and other revenue earning natural resources; b) only participating communities in CBNRM benefit from national resources; c) CBNRM projects tend to be discriminatory in that if, for instance, there are job opportunities, they are reserved for participating localities to the exclusion of other citizens from outside. The contradictory goals on natural resources being a national resource to be used for the benefit of the entire nation as compared to a particular community and employment opportunities being restricted to participating communities are likely to affect the success of CBNRM in the Okavango Delta. Rozemeijer and van der Jagt (2000) note that the exclusive access to wildlife by some communities even though these are entirely dependent on the natural resource and have no other livelihood alternative deprives the majority of the Okavango residents of free meat and access to resources.

#### (d) Enclave tourism and CBNRM

One of the main challenges facing CBNRM in the Okavango Delta is a predominately foreign owned tourism industry otherwise described as enclave tourism. Ceballos-Lascurain (1996) defines enclave tourism as tourism that is concentrated in remote areas in which the types of facilities and their physical location fail to take into consideration the needs and wishes of surrounding communities. The goods and services available are beyond the financial means of the local communities and any foreign currency generated may have only a minimal effect upon the economy of the host location (Ceballos-Lascurain, 1996). CBNRM and enclave tourism in the Okavango Delta compete for the same natural resources such as

land, wildlife and scenic beauty of the area. They also compete for the same clientele who mostly come from North America, Europe and Australia/New Zealand (Mbaiwa, 2002). Enclave tourism in the Okavango Delta is characterised by foreign ownership of tourism facilities, employment, repatriation of funds and failure to effectively contribute to poverty alleviation in the district (Mbaiwa, 2003).

Foreign investors and companies largely own the majority of tourism facilities such as hotels, lodges and camps in the Okavango Delta. Mbaiwa (2002) notes that 53.8% are foreign owned, 27.7% are jointly owned and 18.5% are owned by citizens. This means that about 81.5% of the lodges and camps in the Okavango Delta have foreign influence. Data from the Department of Tourism in 2000 indicate that out of 103 tourism related businesses registered in Maun and operational in Maun and the Okavango Delta, 16 (15.5%) were citizen owned, 36 (35.0%) were jointly owned (between Batswana and non-citizens) while 51 (49.5%) were non-citizens owned. Thus 87 (84.5%) of the tourism related companies registered in Maun and operational in the Okavango have some foreign ownership. Foreign safari companies also dominate concession areas leased by the Tawana Land Board (the Tawana Land Board is the government institution charged with land allocation and management for the Okavango) in the Okavango Delta for tourism purposes. Mbaiwa (2002) notes that out of 15 concession areas leased by the Tawana Land Board, 4 (26.7%) are leased to citizen companies, 6 (40.0%) to joint venture companies, and 5 (33.3%) to non-citizen companies. Non-citizen companies are thus directly involved in 11 (73.3%) of the 15 concession areas under the control of Tawana Land Board.

Glasson *et al.* (1995) note that the dominance of the tourism industry by foreign investors can reduce control over local resources and that this loss of local autonomy is the most negative long-term effect of tourism. Glasson *et al.* (1995) note that a local resident may also suffer a loss of sense of place, as his/her surroundings are transformed to accommodate the requirements of a foreign-dominated tourism industry. Informal interviews with traditional leaders and household representatives in the Okavango indicate that there is a general assumption that the Delta has been taken from them by government and given to foreign tour operators. The fact that tourism is dominated by expatriates, who also happen to derive better benefits than local people creates resentment, antagonisms, and resource conflicts between the local people and foreign investors. Many local people assume the Delta, which has sustained their livelihoods for centuries, has been usurped from them and has been transferred, at least temporarily to foreign tourism operators (Mbaiwa, 1999, 2002). As a result, citizens view enclave tourism negatively because they perceive the domination by non-citizens as 'selling out' their resources (Mbaiwa, 1999). Because of its enclave nature, equal access to and decisions about the use of resources largely excludes local people. This is contrary to the ideals of sustainable development which emphasises equal access and participation in decision-making on natural resources management by all user groups and stakeholders. Glasson *et al.* (1995) and Ceballos-Lascurain (1996) state that a sustainable tourism industry should be sensitive to the needs and aspirations of the host population and provide them the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process.

The tourism industry in Botswana is criticised by bodies such as Botswana Tourism Development Programme (BTDP) and Bank of Botswana (BOB) for its failure to retain revenue in the country. Over 70% of the tourism revenue in Botswana is repatriated outside the country (Botswana Tourism Development Programme, BTDP 1999; Mbaiwa 2002). Tourists spent an estimated P1.1 billion in 1997. Of this gross expenditure, 55% (P605 million or US\$ 101) was spent outside Botswana and a further 16% (P175 or US\$ 29) million was lost through first-round linkages of receipts due to tourist-related imports. Only 29% (P320 million or US\$ 53) was spent in Botswana on local goods, wages, taxes and other activities BTDP 1999; DOT 2000; Mbaiwa, 2002; DOT, 2002). Botswana's present tourism industry, dominated by foreign ownership thus transfers much revenue beyond Botswana's economy which is characteristic of enclave tourism throughout the world (Drakakis-

Smith and Williams, 1983; Dixon and Hefferman, 1991; Ceballos-Lascurain, 1996; Cater, 1991).

Enclave tourism in the Okavango Delta is such that the jobs occupied by local people in the tourism sector are mainly unskilled and attract low salaries. These jobs include manual labour and work as drivers, maids, cleaners, night watchmen, gatekeepers, and cooks. When accompanied to expatriate counterparts who occupy management positions, there is a big salary differential. About 62% of the junior workers in the tourism industry in the Okavango Delta are paid salaries ranging from P300 (US\$ 50) - P900 (US\$ 150) per month whereas senior workers are paid salaries that range from P1,200 (US\$ 200)-P2,400 (US\$ 600) for local staff and P4,500 (US\$ 750) - P8,000 (US\$ 1,333) for expatriate staff. Managing Directors are paid between P15,000 (US\$2,500)-P18,000 (US\$ 3,000) (Mbaiwa, 2002). Ndubano's study (2000) confirms these findings: her sample of 50 citizens employed in the tourism sector in Maun, 33 (66%) earned between P300 (US\$ 50) and P990 (US\$ 165). Ndubano noted that almost two-thirds of the citizens employed in tourism-related jobs in Maun earn less than P954.78 (US\$ 159), the country's poverty datum level in 2000.

The Botswana Tourism Development Programme (BTDP) consultants, whose main focus was salaries in the tourism industry at the national level note that even though the percentage of foreigners in the tourism employment is small (about 4% in the hotel and lodge sectors), they dominate the better paying jobs (BTDP, 1999). According to BTDP, median salaries for citizen workers are P500 (US\$83) per month while those of expatriate staff are P500 (US\$833) per month. The BTDP consultants further report that the gap between citizen and expatriate levels of remuneration becomes still wider when benefits and allowances are taken into consideration. Most expatriate employees qualify for generous tax free gratuities, home leave passages, children's education allowances, furnished housing allowances, and encashment of leave allowances. On the other hand, salaries paid in the tourism sector in the Okavango Delta appear to be consistent with those of other developing countries, notably the Caribbean (Pantin, 1998).

Enclave tourism in the Okavango Delta indicates that tourism in the area is not socio-economic sustainable. However, CBNRM has so far been able to adequately address issues of tourism facilities predominately owned by foreign companies, employment and salary disparities between locals and expatriate staff, and the repatriation of tourism revenue from the Okavango Delta and Botswana. Therefore, it remains to be seen whether CBNRM will in the long run contribute to sustainable tourism development in the Okavango Delta.

#### **CBNRM and natural resource conservation**

One of the pillars of CBNRM is community participation in natural resource management. Through local involvement and ability to derive economic benefits from their resources in their local environment, it is assumed that they will develop positive attitudes towards natural resources hence use them sustainably (Mbaiwa, 1999; Leach, *et al.*, 1999; Tsing, *et al.*, 1999; Twyman, 2000). In assessing the local community attitudes towards natural resources found around them, variables and studies conducted in the Southern African region and in Botswana were closely examined. For example Mordi (1991) and Perkins and Ringrose (1996) state that the attitudes and perceptions of the people in wildlife areas of Botswana are negative towards wildlife conservation. Mbaiwa (1999) also notes that the attitudes and perceptions of the local people in Ngamiland District were predominately negative towards wildlife conservation. Findings by Mwenya *et al.* (1991) in Zimbabwe portray the idea that people's attitudes are largely based on the personal or community ownership they attach to wildlife resources. Mwenya *et al.* (1991) assessed people's attitudes and perceptions about wildlife conservation on the issue of 'who owns wildlife' and 'who should manage it'. Their findings indicate that people view wildlife resources as 'theirs' because they realise the benefits of 'owning' wildlife resources, and they understand wildlife management as a partnership between them and the government.

In using variables similar to those in the above-mentioned studies, in the Okavango Delta, results show the opposite. Here, there seem to be a development of positive attitudes and perceptions by the people of Khwai, Seronga and Ditshiping towards natural resource conservation (in view of previous studies by Mordi (1991), Perkins and Ringrose (1996) and Mbaiwa (1999)). This is shown by 60.9% of the respondents who stated that it is necessary to have wildlife resources in the grasslands and forests of the Okavango Delta. Reasons respondents gave are that wildlife attracts tourists to the area and tourism has created employment opportunities and generate revenue in the district. As a result, the respondents view wildlife as a valuable resource. Conversely, 37.6% of the respondents stated that they do not support the existence of wildlife in the grasslands and forests of the Okavango Delta. These respondents perceive wildlife as destructive to their crops and livestock, as spreading livestock diseases, and that the availability of wildlife in the area has led to much of their land being occupied by foreign tourism investors from which they generally derive little or nothing. This point further shows that enclave tourism in the Okavango Delta antagonizes local people with wildlife conservations.

The Department of Wildlife and National Parks in Maun noted that ever since the introduction of CBNRM in the Okavango, there has been a reduction in poaching statistics. This demonstrates the value that local communities now put on wildlife resources and their willingness to promote the sustainable use of wildlife in their local environment. The general conclusion that was made on the attitudes and perceptions of the local people towards natural resource conservation is that they are changing to promote conservation. As a result, CBNRM has an impact in promoting the sustainable use of natural resources in the Okavango Delta provided it is carried out based on sound management systems.

The direct benefits (e.g. income and employment) resulting from CBNRM, influence the development of positive attitudes and perceptions of the people towards the tourism in the Okavango Delta. About 84.2% of the respondents at Khwai, Seronga and Ditshiping stated that it is important to encourage and support development of tourism in Okavango Delta. The main reasons these respondents gave were that tourism has created job opportunities, generated income, and encouraged rural development in the Okavango. Those who were unsupportive of tourism (9.9%) perceive tourism as a bad industry in that it largely benefits foreign tourist investors who have taken their land, creates land use conflicts between the local farming communities and the wildlife and tourism industry, and does not necessarily benefit them personally in any meaningful way. In concluding the attitudes of the people living in the Okavango towards tourism development in their local environment, the study noted they are positive. Most of the people have come to appreciate tourism as a new economic activity that can support their livelihoods. The communities also acknowledge the link between natural resources and tourism hence the need to use the available resources sustainably.

The need for community participation in natural resource management and tourism in the Okavango Delta has led to the promotion of natural resource conservation strategies and policies being developed by government (note should be taken as some are still on draft form). These strategies and policies include the Wildlife Conservation Policy of 1986, the Tourism Policy (1990), the National Policy on Natural Resource Conservation and Development (1990), the Community-Based Strategy for Rural Development (1997), the Community-Based Natural Resource Management Policy (draft) of 1998, the Joint Venture Guidelines (revised edition) of 1999, the Joint DWNP and Agricultural Resource Board CBNRM Policy (1999), the National Policy on the Use and Management of Natural Resources (draft) of 1999 and the Wetland Policy (draft) of 1999. Most importantly is the listing of the Okavango Delta as a wetland of international importance and Ramsar site in 1997.

#### **Conclusion**

CBNRM in the Okavango Delta has succeeded in income generation, employment creation and the establishment of local institutions meant to ensure local participation in natural resources



management and tourism development. CBNRM has also succeeded in determining the economic value of natural resources in the Okavango Delta. The high economic value placed on natural resources especially wildlife has resulted in the development of positive attitudes of the rural communities towards natural resource conservation particularly wildlife. Although there has been socio-economic, political and conservation benefits achieved through the implementation of CBNRM in the Okavango Delta, the sustainability of the programme remains questionable. However, in the event that all stakeholders (e.g. government, community-based organisations, private sector and non-governmental organisations) share information, building communications networks in promoting trusts and transparent decision making are carried out, there is likely that CBNRM will ultimately achieve its objective. A savingram by the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Local Governments indicates the lack of a shared vision and co-operation on CBNRM by stakeholders.

The successful implementation of CBNRM in the Okavango Delta requires skills not only from the rural communities but to all players in the CBNRM process. For example, if the joint venture partnership is to work efficiently, skills will be required from participatory planning and natural resource management to operation of a tourism commercial enterprise and marketing. The provision of entrepreneurship and managerial skills particularly to rural communities should led to a sustainable tourism industry in the Okavango Delta where all parties are equal partners in benefit sharing as compared to the current scenario where tourism is predominately foreign owned and largely benefits foreign companies and individuals.

Community mobilisation and organisation is largely carried out by the Department of Wildlife and National Parks. Community mobilisation and organisation should belong to communities and it should be directed by their goals and ideas. This then should result in communities having a true sense of ownership of their CBNRM project activities not the thinking that government, a non-governmental organisation or a private sector should run the show. The sustainability of CBNRM should in this case make rural communities have a sense of ownership of the natural resources on which their projects are based with benefits of use clearly at their disposal not managed by government.

CBNRM largely emphasises the generation of financial revenues from wildlife resources and less so community empowerment. This is because CBNRM in Botswana was adopted under a narrow framework of achieving wildlife conservation, rather than the need for social empowerment or economic development in rural settlements. Economic benefits were seen as a means of achieving conservation especially wildlife resources, as well as being an end in themselves. Equally important to financial revenues and accrue to communities are empowerment benefits such as increased control over development, organisational capacity at a community level, human resource development and natural resource monitoring and management capacity.

The CBNRM concept was developed from a wildlife utilisation perspective. This has as a result, underestimated the potential value of and resource management linkages with other natural resources such as veld products and cultural activities. Traditional villages by the Okavango Poler's Trust, Khwai Development Trust and Bakhakwe Conservtion Trust where traditional activities are provided for the tourism market indicates that a more integral approach in CBNRM is needed in the Okavango Delta. As a result, marketing of veld products and cultural activities will need to be carried out with that of wildlife and the scenic beauty of the Okavango Delta. Despite the problems that affect the successful implementation of CBNRM in the Okavango Delta, CBNRM provides an alternative sustainable model of tourism development that is appropriate for area. This is because CBNRM promotes rural community development, community participation in tourism development and the sustainable use of natural resources.

## REFERENCES

- Agrawal, A. and Gibson, C., 1999: Enchantment and disenchantment: the role of community in natural resource conservation, *Wildlife Development*, 27, 629-49.
- Ashley, C., 1995: Community based tourism as a strategy for CBNRM: options and potentials for achieving conservation and development through non-consumptive tourism in Namibia. In: Rihoy, E. (ed.), *The Commons Without Tragedy? Strategies for Community-based Natural Resources Management in Southern Africa*, Proceedings of the Regional Natural Resources Management Programme Annual Conference, SADC Wildlife Technical Co-ordinating Unit, Kasane, 56-94.
- Botswana Tourism Development Programme, BTDP, 1999: *Tourism Economic Impact Assessment*, Department of Tourism, Gaborone.
- Boggs, L.P., 2002: Community-based natural resource management in the Okavango Delta, Unpublished Paper, Maun.
- Carter, E., 1991: Sustainable tourism in the Third World: problems and prospects, Discussion Paper No. 3, University of Reading, Reading.
- Cassidy, L., 2001: Improving women's participation in CBNRM in Botswana, CBNRM Support Programme, Occasional Paper No 5, IUCN/SNV CBNRM Support Programme, Gaborone.
- Cassidy, L., 2000: CBNRM and legal rights to resources in Botswana, CBNRM Support Programme, Occasional Paper No 4, IUCN/SNV CBNRM Support Programme, Gaborone.
- Ceballos-Lascurain, H., 1996: *Tourism, Ecotourism and Protected Areas*, IUCN Publication, Gland.
- Central Statistic Office, 2002: *National Population and Housing Census*, Ministry of Finance and Development Planning, Gaborone.
- Chadwick Anderson and Partners, 1998: *Notarial Deed of Trust Okavango Polers Trust*, Chadwick Anderson and Partners, Gaborone.
- Cruz, E., 1995: Mozambique: Community-based natural resources management initiatives. In: Rihoy, E. (ed.), *The Commons Without Tragedy? Strategies for Community-based Natural Resources Management Programme in Southern Africa*. Proceedings of the Regional Natural Resources Management Programme Annual Conference: SADC Wildlife Technical Coordinating Unit, Kasane, 205-208.
- Department of Wildlife and National Parks, DWNP, 2000: *CBNRM Progress Report*, Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Gaborone.
- Department of Wildlife and National Parks, DWNP, 1999: *Joint Venture Guidelines*, Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Gaborone.
- Dixon, C. and Heffernan, M., 1991: *Colonialism and Development in the Contemporary World*. Mansell, London.
- Drakakis-Smith, D. and Williams, S., 1983: *Internal Colonialism: Essays around a Theme*, Developing Areas Research Group, Institute of British Geographers, Edinburgh.
- Fortman, L., Roe, E. and Van Eeten, M. 2001: At the threshold between governance and management: community-based natural resource management in southern Africa, *Public Administration and Development*, 21, 171-185.
- George, J. and Dei, S., 1995: Indigenous knowledge as an empowerment tool for sustainable development in Zambia. In Singh. N. and Titi. N. (eds.), *Empowerment: Towards Sustainable Development*, Zed Books, London.
- Glasson, J., Godfrey, K. and Goodey, B., 1995: *Towards Visitor Impact Management: Visitor Impacts, Carrying Capacity and Management Responses in Europe's Historic Towns and Cities*, Avebury, Aldershot.
- Government of Botswana, 1997: National Development Plan VIII 1997-2003. Government Printer, Gaborone.
- Gujadhar, T., 2001: Joint venture options for communities and safari operators in Botswana, CBNRM Support Programme, Occasional Paper No 6, IUCN/SNV CBNRM Support Programme, Gaborone.
- Gujadhar, T., 2000: Organisations and their approaches in community-based natural resources management in Botswana, Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe, CBNRM Support Programme, Occasional Paper No 6, IUCN/SNV CBNRM Support Programme, Gaborone.

- Kgathi, D.L., Mbaiwa, J.E. and Motsholapheko, M., 2002: Local institutions and natural resource management in Ngamiland. Harry Oppenheimer Okavango Research Centre, University of Botswana, Maun.
- Lawry, S.W. 1994: Structural adjustment and natural resources in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Society and Natural Resources*, 7: 383-387.
- Leach, M., Mearns, R. and Scoones, I., 1999: Environmental entitlements: dynamics and institutions in community-based natural resources management, *Wildlife Development* 27, 225-47.
- Markandya, A., 1993: Criteria for sustainable agricultural development, In: Markandya, A. and Richardson, J. (eds.), *Environmental Economics: a Reader*, St Martins Press, New York.
- Masika, A., 1995: Kenya; A review of the Cobra Programme and potential linkages with SADC Countries, in Rihoy, E. (ed.), *The Commons Without Tragedy? Strategies for Community-based Natural Resources Management in Southern Africa*, Proceedings of the Regional Natural Resources Management Programme Annual Conference: SADC Wildlife Technical Co-ordinating Unit, Kasane, 66-89.
- Mbaiwa, J.E., 1999: Prospects for sustainable wildlife resource utilisation and management in Botswana: a case study of East Ngamiland District, Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, Department of Environmental Science, University of Botswana, Gaborone.
- Mbaiwa, J.E., 2002: The socio-economic and environmental impacts of tourism development in the Okavango Delta, Botswana: a baseline study. Harry Oppenheimer Okavango Research Centre, University of Botswana, Maun.
- Mbaiwa, J.E. 2003: Community-based tourism in Ngamiland District, Botswana: development, impacts and challenges. In: Darkoh, M.B.K. and Rwomire, A. (eds.), *The Human Impact on the Environment and Sustainable Development in Africa*, Ashgate, Aldershot, 379-402.
- Mbanefo, S., and de Boerr, H. 1993: CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe. In: Kemf, E. (ed.), *Indigenous Peoples and Protected Areas: The Law of The Mother*, Earthscan, London, 81-88.
- Munasinghe, M. and McNeely, J., 1995: Key concepts and terminology of sustainable development. In: Munasinghe, M. and Shearer, W. (eds.), *Defining and Measuring Sustainability: The Biological Foundations*, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, Washington, 19-46.
- Molale, E., 2001: Management of funds realised from the Community Based Natural Resources Management Project, Savingram No LG 3/6/2/1 IV (46) of 30th January 2001. Ministry of Local Governments, Gaborone.
- Monthe, Marumo and Company, 1995: *Notarial Deed of Trust for Okavango Community Trust*, Monthe, Marumo and Company, Gaborone.
- Mordi, R., 1991: *Public Attitudes Towards Wildlife in Botswana*, Garland Publishing, New York.
- Mwenya, A.N., Lewis, D.M. and Kaweche, G.B. 1991: *Policy, Background and Future: National Parks and Wildlife Services, New Administrative Management Design for Game Management Areas*. USAID, Lusaka.
- Mvimi, E.T., 2000: Assessing and comparing success of four community-based organisations managing natural resources in northern Botswana, Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, Centre for International and Environmental Studies, Agricultural University of Norway.
- National CBNRM Forum, 2001: Proceedings of the Second National CBNRM Conference in Botswana, 14th -16th November 2001, IUCN/SNV CBNRM Support Programme, Gaborone.
- North West District CBNRM Forum, 2001: Minutes of the 5th North West District CBNRM Forum, March 29th, 2001, Maun.
- Paehlke, R., 1999: Towards defining, measuring and achieving sustainability: tools and strategies for environmental valuation. In: Becker, E. and Jahn, T. (eds.), *Sustainability and the Social Sciences*, Zed Books, London.
- Pantini, D.A., 1998: *Tourism in St. Lucia. Sustainable Economic Development Unit for Small and Island Development States*, University of the West Indies, St Augustine.
- Perkins, J.S. and Ringrose, S.M., 1996: Development co-operation's objectives and the Beef Protocol: the case of Botswana. A study of livestock/wildlife/tourism /degradation linkages. Department of Environmental Science, University of Botswana, Gaborone.
- Perrings, C., 1991: The preservation of natural capital and environmental control. Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of EARE, Stockholm.
- Pimbert, M. and Pretty, J., 1995: Parks, people, and professionals: putting participation into protected area management, UNRISD Discussion Paper No. 57, Geneva: UNRISD.
- Rihoy, E., 1995: From state control of wildlife to co-management of natural resources-the evolution of community management in southern Africa. In: Rihoy, E. (ed.), *The Commons Without Tragedy? Strategies for Community-based Natural Resources Management in Southern Africa*, Proceedings of the Regional Natural Resources Management Programme Annual Conference: SADC Wildlife Technical Co-ordinating Unit, Kasane, 1-36
- Rothert, S., 1997: Which way the Okavango? In KCS and DWNP (eds.), *Conservation and Management of Wildlife in Botswana - Strategies for 21st Century*, Proceedings of Conference hosted by the Department of Wildlife and National Parks and Kalahari Conservation Society, Gaborone, 158-162.
- Rozemeijer, N. and Van der Jagt, C., 2000: Community-based natural resource management in Botswana: how community-based is community-based natural resource management in Botswana, Occasional Paper Series, IUCN/SNV CBNRM Support Programme, Gaborone.
- Rozemeijer, N., Cassidy, L., Smith, R. and Van Bussel, F., 1999: History and achievements, Background Paper, National Conference on CBNRM in Botswana, Gaborone Sun, 26-29th July 1999, Gaborone.
- Serageldin, I., 1993: Making development sustainable, *Finance and Development*, 10-13.
- Steiner, A. and Rihoy, E., 1995: *The Commons Without Tragedy? Strategies for Community-based Natural Resources Management in Southern Africa*. Proceedings of the Regional Natural Resources Management Programme Annual Conference: SADC Wildlife Technical Co-ordinating Unit, Kasane, 1-36
- Taylor, M., 2001: Whose agendas? Reassessing the role of CBNRM in Botswana, National Museum of Botswana, Gaborone.
- Taylor, M., 2000: Life, land and power, contesting development in northern Botswana, Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh.
- Thakadu, O.T., 1997: Indigenous wildlife knowledge systems and their role in facilitating community-based wildlife management projects in Botswana, Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, School of Environment and Development, University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg.
- Tsing, A.L., Brosius, J.P. and Zerner, C., 1999: Assessing community-based natural resource management, *Ambio*, 28, 197-198.
- Twyman, C., 1998: Rethinking community resource management: managing resources or managing people in western Botswana? *Third World Quarterly* 19, 745-770.
- Twyman, C., 2000: Participatory conservation? Community-based natural resource management in Botswana, *The Geographical Journal*, 166, 323-335.
- UNCED, 1992: *United Nations Conference on Environment and Development Report*, United Nations, New York.
- Western, D., Wright, M. and Strum, S., (eds.), 1994: *Natural Connections: Perspectives in Community-Based Conservation*, Island Press, Washington, D.C.
- World Commission on Environment and Development, (WCED) 1987: *Our Common Future*, Oxford University Press, London.
- Joseph E. Mbaiwa  
University of Botswana  
Harry Oppenheimer Okavango Research Centre  
Private Bag 285, Maun, Botswana  
E-mail: mbaiwaje@hotmail.com