
Tourism, Communities and National Policy: Namibia's Experience

Caroline Ashley*

Since independence, the tourism sector in Namibia has grown rapidly (National Planning Commission, 1995). Since 1995 community involvement in tourism has been an explicit government strategy, promoted by a range of governmental and non-governmental actors. Much has already been learned about the economic, social, and livelihood impacts of tourism in rural areas, and how these are shaped by the type of tourism and, in turn, by government policy.

This article starts by categorising tourism initiatives on communal land into five different types, and assessing the financial and social impacts of each. However, if the long-term aim is 'rural development', measures of financial and social impact are too limited, and a broader perspective — contribution to livelihood security of different stakeholders — is proposed. This assessment is based on the direct contribution of tourism to a variety of household needs and assets, as well as its indirect impact through conflicts and complementarities with other livelihood activities and land uses. As many community tourism initiatives also have conservation objectives, the article reviews additional criteria that need to be considered to achieve these, such as a tangible link between sustainable management and rewards from tourism, and distribution of benefits across all members of a common property resource regime. Performance of tourism initiatives is assessed against these criteria and constraints identified. The article then moves on to outline the various strategies that have been used to promote community involvement in tourism. In conclusion, it identifies lessons learned to date in Namibia, and draws implications for policy-makers on the range of strategies that can be useful in enhancing positive impacts and minimising negative ones.

Background

The impact of tourism in the rural areas of Namibia is shaped by historical and geographical factors. Namibia gained its independence from neighbouring South

* Research Fellow, Overseas Development Institute. Previously Resource Economist in the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Namibia (1993–7).

Africa in 1990, but still has an apartheid legacy. Income distribution is highly skewed, and 40% of the land (824,000 km² in total (MET, 1992)) is 'communal land' — former homelands where residents have usufruct rights but land and wildlife are owned by the state. Namibia is the most arid country in Africa south of the Sahara; much of the land is suitable only for extensive livestock production and/or wildlife. In communal areas, livestock production is mainly for subsistence and is combined with crop cultivation and harvesting of wild resources. The wildlife endowment includes desert-adapted species in the west, and more typical African game in the central savannah and wetter northeast. The majority of wildlife is found outside national parks (which account for 13% of the land area) on both communal and commercial land (*ibid.*). The tourism product is based on wildlife and spectacular wilderness, with product differentiation between protected areas (conventional safaris), private wildlife reserves (luxury safaris), commercial farmland (hunting, farm stays) and communal (more adventurous safaris and/or exclusive wilderness). This article focuses on tourism development in communal areas, and its impact on the residents of those areas.

Like other governments in southern Africa, the Namibian Government has reduction of poverty and inequality as key medium-term objectives (NPC, 1995), with promotion of tourism as a macroeconomic strategy. The search for the link between the two — for tourism to be a vehicle of rural development — emerged in 1994, driven by a variety of actors from non-governmental organisations, government departments, and donor agencies, and with a mixture of development and conservation objectives. From the *development perspective*, tourism is seen as one of the few industries suitable to remote areas of the country. It can create enterprise opportunities in areas where diversification from unreliable agriculture is sorely needed. *Conservationist* interest in community tourism rests on the assumption that, by generating direct local benefits from wildlife, tourism helps create incentives for the conservation of, and investment in, wildlife and habitat by local communities. This article assesses tourism impacts primarily from the development perspective of reducing poverty and enhancing livelihood security, while also considering their relevance to conservation objectives.

The term 'community involvement in tourism' is used for its convenience rather than its precision. In some cases, it is an organised community, or its representatives, that engages in tourism. In others, local residents act on an individual basis. While debates about definitions of community tourism, community-based tourism and community involvement continue (e.g., ART, 1998), two pointers guide the scope of discussions here. First, in order to consider the relevance of tourism to local development, the impacts of *all* forms of involvement, whether by communities or individuals, whether community 'based' or not, need to be analysed because they are already affecting rural lives, even if the resulting prescription focuses on the more community-driven

forms of tourism. Secondly, while recognising the problem of defining 'the community' (Elliffe et al., 1997; Steiner and Rihoy, 1995; Blench, 1998) and that communities are not always the appropriate institutional actors, particularly in enterprise development, the concept of community is nevertheless relevant to Namibian tourism because common pool resources are involved and because community-level institutions are the ones to which tourism rights are being devolved. In 1996, legislation was passed to enable communities to establish wildlife 'conservancies' — legally registered bodies formed by a community, with a constitution, registered members, committees, and locally agreed boundaries — to which the Namibian Government will devolve conditional consumptive and non-consumptive use rights over wildlife. Now that the first conservancies are registered, they are planning and developing wildlife-utilisation options, with a heavy emphasis on tourism.

Findings presented here draw on the work of a range of partners in the Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) programme, but particularly on research by the Resource Economics Programme of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism since 1993. This used a combination of methods, complementing development of economic cost-benefit models of wildlife enterprises (see Barnes, 1995) with policy analysis, collaboration with NGOs, and direct provision of extension support to communities active in CBNRM. Qualitative analysis of social and livelihood issues is largely based on NGO grey literature, participatory planning in northwest Namibia conducted during the development phase of a new DFID-funded project on 'Wildlife Integration for Livelihood Diversification' (Croxtton, 1997; Ashley, 1997a and b) and desk research covering the northeast conducted for the WWF-US/USAID Living in a Finite Environment (LIFE) programme (Ashley and LaFranchi, 1997).

Alternative models of tourism on communal land

Current tourism enterprise activities on communal land can be classified into five groups:

(i) *A private lodge or luxury tented camp for wildlife-viewing tourists (or fishers, hunters):* These operate with government permission but without agreement from the local residents. This is the traditional model, of which there are many examples in Kunene (northwest), Okavango and Caprivi (northeast) and Omusati (north-central) Regions.

(ii) *A private lodge voluntarily sharing revenue with the community:* Lianshulu Lodge in Caprivi and Etendeka Camp in Kunene are privately owned and run, operating in government-granted concessions. But they voluntarily pay a bed-night levy to the local communities surrounding the land that they use.

(iii) A *'joint venture' lodge as a partnership between a private investor and the local community*: A private investor builds and operates the lodge, but in a contractual relationship with the community, which makes a recognised contribution to the enterprise in return for a share of the financial and other benefits. The first such venture, 'Damaraland Camp', opened in Kunene Region in 1996 as a partnership between the Torra Conservancy and Wilderness Safaris. At least two other deals have been negotiated but eventually stalled, while new deals are emerging. In each existing and proposed contract, the community leases tourism rights to the company and receives a percentage of the revenue — a model similar to that used by Rural Councils in Zimbabwe's Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE), which lease out hunting quotas to private operators (Bond, 1996), and in contrast to examples in South Africa where communities are often involved as equity-holders rather than lessors (de Beer and Elliffe, 1997).

(iv) A *local enterprise run by representatives of 'the community' or a local entrepreneur*: These include a number of campsites, demonstration traditional villages, craft centres and guiding services. Some can be said to be 'community enterprises' in that they are operated by a few local residents (one or two for the campsites, a dozen or more for the villages and craft centres) with some form of agreement with the broader community. Others are run independently by a single local entrepreneur or family. A few receive marketing or financial assistance from private operators and are not clearly distinguished from category (iii).

(v) *Informal sector suppliers of goods and services*: Local residents sell food, building materials and casual labour to tourism lodges, and crafts and food to tourists. Some of these activities could be subsumed under the 'lodges' (categories i–iii) and others could be classified as local entrepreneurs (category iv) but research has shown the importance of focusing specifically on the informal sector supply of goods and services as an opportunity for expanding local involvement in tourism (Goodwin et al., 1997; Ashley and LaFranchi, 1997) and therefore the value of analysing it separately.

In any tourism area, a combination of enterprises is likely. The three types of lodges can be seen as alternatives, although a joint venture is not always an option at every site. Community and informal sector enterprises are likely to occur where lodges or other larger enterprises already exist (although in developing any specific site, a community may face a choice between a joint venture and a community enterprise).

Financial, social and livelihood impacts

Each type of enterprise generates different local impacts, with varying distribution and significance among local residents.

Financial impact: In assessing financial impacts on the local economy, the key questions are how much cash is generated locally, how many local people benefit, and who benefits (particularly do the poorest residents benefit)?¹ There are three types of local cash income, which are quite different in their amount and distribution: *wages* of full-time employees; *casual earnings* from selling products and labour (informal sector earnings); and collective income earned by community institutions, either from profits of community enterprises, or leases and other fees paid by private enterprises. Table 1 summarises the typical level of cash benefits generated by each of the 5 types of enterprise.

As Table 1 shows, any type of lodge provides a significant cash injection to the local economy in the form of wages.² However, concession fees, leases, or other collective income from a joint venture lodge can generate as much income again, more than doubling the total local income. A joint venture lodge is also likely to employ more local labour and source more products locally, as most community-private sector contracts (in Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa) make provision for this in the agreement. Local income from community enterprises or informal sector activities is tiny in comparison with income from lodges, but has other advantages, as discussed below.

Each type of income — wages, casual earnings and collective income— has different development impacts because they are distributed differently across the community. Table 2 shows the estimated amount and spread of each type for 5 communities in tourism areas of Caprivi, each of which has, or is developing, a combination of 3–4 tourism enterprises. Both wages and casual earnings reach only a minority of households (1–11%). For those in employment, wages of N\$2–3,000 per year are a substantial cash boost which could lift a household from insecurity to relative security in a context where minimum cash needs are estimated at around N\$1,300–1,800 per year (FAO, 1992). Casual earnings are much lower, but are more likely to be earned by cash-strapped households who

1. Profitability of the enterprise is also critical — if the enterprise is not financially viable, it will not last and nor will the impacts assessed here. Achieving profitability within community tourism is a major challenge. However, as this article focuses on impacts, profitability is not explored here. The estimated financial benefits presented below are based on calculations and empirical research of what can be afforded while maintaining profitability.

2. The full value of local wages from the lodge is reckoned on the assumption that this represents the marginal increase in local wages, given the shortage of rural-based employment opportunities. In practice, there may be some displacement of other earnings, which would make the net cash injection slightly lower than indicated.

Table 1
Nature and scale of local financial benefits from 5 types of tourism enterprise
(1996 N\$000/year^a)

	<i>Private lodge</i>	<i>Revenue-sharing lodge</i>	<i>Joint venture lodge</i>	<i>Community enterprise</i>	<i>Informal sector activities</i>
Wages ^b	40–80	40–80+	40–100+	4–10	-
Casual earnings	0.2–2 ^c	0.2–2	2–6	0.1–9	0.1–10
Collective income	-	15–20 ^d	50–100 ^e	1–10	-
Total	40–82	55–102+	92–206+	4–20 ^f	0.1–10 ^g

a) N\$1= 1 South African Rand. In 1996, approximately N\$3.5= US\$1. Currently, N\$6 = US\$1, but this rate should not be applied to 1996 prices due to inflation since then.

b) Assumptions: a private lodge employs 7–12 local staff for unskilled work, at around N\$600 per month (Barnes, 1995; Ashley and LaFranchi, 1997). A revenue-sharing lodge may make greater efforts to employ local staff, so reaching higher totals. A joint venture lodge is likely to have contractual commitments to give preferential employment locally, and to train and employ locals for more skilled, higher-paid work. For example, the Damaraland Camp will pay around \$100,000 per year in wages to local staff (Ward, 1996).

c) Highly variable. Low estimate of N\$200/year assumes lodge buys thatching grass, but no food or curios. Higher estimate of N\$600 covers grass plus fish, meat, vegetables. Higher figures for joint venture lodge based on Damaraland Camp figures for 1996–7, which include wood and laundry services (Davis, 1998).

d) eg: a N\$5-10 bed-night levy from lodges charging a few hundred Namibian dollars per night. Lianshulu Lodge (Caprivi Region) distributed N\$26,000 collected as N\$5 bed-night levies in 1994 and part of 1993. Etendeka Camp distributed N\$36,342 in 1996 representing N\$10-12 levies collected since 1994.

e) 5–12% of turnover of a mid-market lodge. The percentage that is affordable while maintaining profitability depends on several factors, including the quality of the resources contributed by the community. Damaraland Camp paid N\$55,000 in the first year of operation when occupancy was 40% and rates relatively low (Davis, 1998). As both rise (possibly by 50%), income could double. Higher fees are possible if a concession area is included.

f) The minimum total may be less than the sum of each component, if only one or two of the types of income are generated.

g) N\$100 for a farmer/fisher selling food occasionally to the tourism sector. N\$10,000/year for a skilled craft-maker, earning \$1,000/month for much of the year.

Sources: adapted from Ashley and LaFranchi, 1997 and Ashley, 1995, based on financial cost-benefit models of enterprises by Barnes (1995).

depend on gathering and selling local products to make ends meet. A few hundred dollars can therefore fill a critical shortage for poorer households,

paying for one to three months of grain in a dry year, or covering school fees and other education expenses at the start of the school year. Collective income is quite different because of its potential to be distributed across *all* households as a cash dividend, or invested in community infrastructure. So far in Namibia, more than half of the 10 communities that have received bed-night levy income have chosen to distribute cash dividends (Wyckoff–Baird, 1995; Davis, 1996), following a similar approach to that used by many CAMPFIRE wards in Zimbabwe (Bond, 1996).

Table 2
Spread of financial benefits across households: averages from 5 communities in tourism areas of Caprivi, north-east Namibia

<i>Amount and distribution</i>	<i>Type of local income</i>		
	<i>Wages</i>	<i>Casual earnings</i>	<i>Collective income</i>
N\$/year/community	300,000	48,000	484,000
% of total local income	36	4	58
Earners per community	15	18	240
% of local households earning	1–7	1–11	Up to 100
Type of earner	Language skills, some education, men and women	Dependent on piece-work and casual sales, majority women	Depends on how funds are spent
N\$ per earner (avg.)	2,714	520	240

All figures are averages across the five communities. They are based on detailed estimates of tourism income in the five communities once current wildlife tourism plans are developed (Ashley and LaFranchi, 1997), using cost-benefit models of 12 different types of tourism enterprise from Barnes (1995). In all five communities a range of enterprises exist or are planned, including a joint venture lodge in four of the five. Population ranges from 150 to 1250 households per community. Financial inputs by community members are not taken into account as they are not yet significant, but planning has started for communities to spend their collective income on community game guards and other running costs associated with maintaining wildlife and tourism. This will mean that up to one third of collective income will be spent on local labour and products, increasing the percentage of households' earning income, and decreasing the dividend per household from collective income.

The key implications of this analysis are, first, the importance of joint venture lodges for generating substantially more local income than a private lodge, and

particularly collective income which can reach all households. Where they are financially and organisationally feasible,³ they offer clear advantages over private lodges. Secondly, the importance of casual earnings, not because of their scale, but because they can be earned by the poorest households. The potential to increase informal sector earnings in the tourism industry has not yet been carefully assessed. However, ongoing work in Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe suggests that local economic linkages cannot be assumed, but can be expanded considerably (multiplied) if concerted efforts are made (de Beer and Elliffe, 1997; Goodwin et al., 1997; Healy, 1994; Ashley and LaFranchi, 1997; ART, forthcoming). Thirdly, as wages comprise a substantial share of total cash benefits, measures to increase labour intensity can strongly affect the size of the total cash injection into the local economy, though wage-earners are still likely to be a small minority of households. These findings in turn have implications for policy-makers, as discussed below.

Social impacts: Social impacts of tourism are difficult to quantify but appear to be significant in Namibia, in contrast to experience elsewhere. Whereas the CAMPFIRE programme in Zimbabwe has focused on generating cash benefits for local communities, most of the benefits of Namibian CBNRM over the past 15 years have been social (Jones, 1997 and forthcoming; Ashley, 1998). This also contrasts with much international experience of negative social impacts, such as cultural disruption and loss of rights (e.g., Brown et al., 1995; Berger, 1996; Morris-Jarra, 1996; Koch, 1994; Brandon and Wells, 1992).

So far, the main observed social benefits gained by some local residents and communities involved in tourism within the CBNRM programme are:

(i) *Development of skills for individuals:* For example, local employees (men and women) of Damaraland Camp are receiving training in tourism, including professional and managerial skills. Members of the committee who negotiated the joint venture gained negotiation skills, which they now share with other communities through exchange visits.

(ii) *Institutional development and stronger community organisation:* Participation in tourism enterprises has helped to catalyse improvements in the internal organisation of communities. Institutions appropriate to new challenges have emerged, ranging from bed-night levy committees at community level and half a dozen legally registered conservancies to acquire wildlife/tourism rights from the government, to regional and national fora for communities and conservancies

3. Financial and organisational feasibility is not explored here, though the growing number of joint ventures in southern Africa suggests that financial viability is not a great problem where the community has assets of market value, but organisational and transaction costs are more of a constraint.

to co-ordinate efforts. Other organisational developments observed within communities active in the CBNRM programme include definition of community boundaries, membership and shared objectives, accountability and replacement of committee members, use of elections, new mechanisms for information flow between members and leaders, greater involvement of women in information-gathering and decision-making, and consensus-building on conservancy plans (Ashley, 1998, drawing on Jones, 1997 and forthcoming; Durbin et al., 1997; IRDNC, 1996).

(iii) *Improved relations with neighbours*: Although competition for the spoils of tourism has increased conflict between neighbouring communities, in some cases tourism benefits have also provided the incentive to overcome long-standing conflicts for the sake of co-operation. For example, recipients of bed-night levies in both Kunene and Caprivi included long-standing rivals and different tribal groups, who worked together on distribution. Effective negotiation with neighbours is not only important for developing tourism, but is also vital to natural resource management and livelihood protection in such arid areas where there are multiple resources with overlapping tenure rights, and where mobility is critical to cope with variability (Scoones et al., 1996; Sullivan, 1996).

(iv) *Strength in dealing with outsiders*: Enhanced internal organisation, combined with improved access to information and recognition of (albeit limited) market power, has given some communities greater confidence and capacity in dealing with outsiders from the private sector and government. Two conservancy committees (Torra and Salambala) negotiated tourism contracts with tourism investors. This involved protracted complex discussions and two to three years of negotiating with experienced private operators. The fact that Torra *rejected* one joint venture proposal is in itself a sign of empowerment. Another example comes from West Caprivi, where the Kxoe community ('bushmen'), having faced years of obstruction from the government in their attempt to set up a community campsite, are now taking the government to court.

(v) *Cultural values of wildlife and traditional skills*: Tourism enterprises are revitalising some cultural practices and traditional skills. For example, traditional dance is flourishing at a Caprivi Traditional Village and through occasional performances at lodges, while Ju'hoansi tracking skills, which were dying out, are gaining new value for tourist-guiding in former Bushmanland (Wyckoff-Baird, 1995). Wildlife have — or traditionally had — cultural value in most Namibian rural communities (Jones, forthcoming). As tourism provides a financial means to maintain wildlife and wildlife habitat, it generates, in turn, cultural values, which are particularly significant to older residents.

An example of a tourism initiative that generated a range of social benefits is the distribution of bed-night levies from Etendeka Tented Camp (Kunene Region) to neighbouring communities. Over N\$32,000, collected through N\$10 and N\$12 bed-night levies, was shared amongst five communities bordering the lodge's concession area. The use of the money was not simply decided by chiefs or development committees. With the help of a local NGO (Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation), each community appointed a Bed-Night Levy Committee. The five committees jointly agreed how funds should be shared between the five communities, and then each surveyed their own residents on how the funds should be used and which institutions should receive them. This process had several positive impacts (Durbin et al., 1997; Jones, 1997; Davis 1996):

- Development of institutions (bed-night levy committees) at a scale appropriate to the task.
- Transparency and accountability: democratic decisions on the use of funds contrasted with previous experience in the area when income from wildlife has been appropriated by a few leaders.
- Participation of women in the committees and decision-making process. (Gender analysis of a similar process for the Lianshulu bed-night levy distribution in Caprivi found substantial female participation in decisions on use of funds in the majority of villages (Nabane, 1995).)
- Improved relations with neighbours: the five communities included different ethnic groups with long-standing rivalries. The levy provided an incentive for working together.
- Social cohesion. Each community defined the extent of its members (which in a pastoral system involved protracted discussions), and came together for a celebration and distribution ceremony.

Social costs: However, there are also costs involved. The processes described above have involved substantial time, effort, risk and disagreement. In some cases, tourism planning has stimulated conflicts within and between communities, which have not yet been resolved. For example, the Lianshulu community have been offered a tourism concession inside Mudumo National Park (East Caprivi) because they were evicted from the land when the Park was created. However, this has created great tensions with the neighbouring Sauzuo community, on whose land they have been living since eviction. While there has been talk of limited sharing of benefits, the deeper conflict is about control. The importance of this cannot be quantified, and even if it could, tourism is only one

causal factor. Nevertheless, the potential destabilisation of livelihoods is significant. The need to invest time is also evident at Lianshulu, where it is estimated that the Development Committee Chair spent 35–40 days on the project during the first eight months; at that rate of progress, total time input by community leaders could amount to up to 720 days over a year and a half. In addition to the positive examples above, other tourism developments on communal land have *not* involved the community and have therefore generated social costs such as loss of control, disempowerment, and lost access to resources.

Implications: For some communities, participation in tourism has stimulated improvements in local skills, institutions, community organisation, and external relations. In combination, these enable communities to improve their management of common resources and to take more control of events and decisions around them. Jones (1997) concludes that ‘the conservancy approach provides the opportunity for local communities to form strong common property resource management institutions not only for wildlife and tourism, but most other communal resources on their land’. Tourism has played a role in this by providing a tangible focus and return to conservancy development. These social benefits of empowerment are difficult to quantify but can have important ramifications for livelihood security, environmental management, and democratic functioning.

Such social benefits can arise from joint ventures, revenue-sharing from private lodges and community enterprises, as each of these can develop skills and require local decision-making over land use, benefits or enterprise development. The distribution of potential social benefits across types of enterprises is therefore different from the distribution of financial benefits, as summarised in Table 3. However, an important caveat must be borne in mind. These social benefits cannot be attributed to tourism *per se*, but to *how* tourism development and CBNRM have been pursued. Community tourism is one component of the Community Based Natural Resource Management programme, which is fundamentally an effort to help communities to develop institutions which can manage common property resources successfully (Jones, 1997). In many cases tourism has provided a further stimulus for institutional development (see example of bed-night levies above) but the way that communities have responded to these opportunities is as much an *indicator* of empowerment as a cause.

As Table 3 shows, different types of tourism enterprise can generate quite different types of benefits and costs. A joint venture lodge generates more types of local benefits, and greater cash benefits than a conventional private lodge. It is also less likely to bring disempowerment of the community or alienation from resources, but it entails new kinds of costs for the community, such as effort and risk, and is not always feasible. A revenue-sharing lodge falls midway

between the two, in terms of both benefits and costs. Informal and community enterprises generate almost negligible cash benefits by comparison but can nevertheless be invaluable complements to formal sector lodges for distributional and social reasons. Tourism planning needs to take into account which benefits are to be prioritised, and how implementation should proceed to ensure that potential benefits are maximised or costs minimised, within the constraints of long-term profitability and sustainability.

Table 3
Comparison of financial and social impacts generated by 5 types of tourism enterprises

<i>Potential financial and social benefits</i>	<i>Type of tourism enterprise</i>				
	<i>Private lodge</i>	<i>Revenue-sharing lodge</i>	<i>Joint venture lodge</i>	<i>Community enterprise</i>	<i>Informal sector activities</i>
Amount of local cash earnings	**	**	***	*	*
Distribution across all households		*	*	*	
Cash to poorest households		*	*	*	***
Skill development		*	**	**	
Institutional development		**	***	**	
Local/community control		*	***	***	**
Costs	Lost access to land/resources Disempowerment	Loss of land Community lack rights and responsibilities	Difficult Time, effort, risk Long-term investment of land/resources Potential local conflicts Needs support	Difficult Time, effort, risk Potential local conflicts	Lack of market power, risk of exploitation

Impact is indicated by *, greatest impact by ***.

Impacts on multiple livelihood strategies: Livelihood security in arid and semi-arid areas does not depend simply on maximising cash income, as rural households have multiple objectives. These can, for analytical purposes, be categorised⁴ as fulfillment of a range of basic needs, investment in capital assets that underpin livelihood strategies (social capital, human resources, physical and financial reserves, natural resources) and other less tangible long-term priorities such as resilience and gaining influence over external constraining factors. The preceding sections on the financial and social impacts of tourism have already indicated that tourism not only contributes directly to cash needs but also affects the asset base in terms of social capital (community organisation), natural capital (management of common property resources) and human resources (skills). Survey work in Caprivi shows that tourism earnings are invested in physical assets, particularly livestock, and in food security through purchases of food and investment in cultivation (Nabane, 1995).

However, consideration of livelihood impacts needs to go beyond the direct contribution to needs and assets in two ways. First, households pursue their livelihood security through a combination of on-farm and off-farm activities, utilising a variety of resources and a mosaic of land uses. Tourism is not an alternative to these, but an addition, which needs to be integrated into existing livelihood strategies with minimum opportunity cost in terms of the land, labour and capital consumed. Therefore the impact of tourism on rural livelihoods also depends on how it conflicts with or complements *other* livelihood activities. Table 4 illustrates how tourism can positively and negatively affect other livelihood activities of households in Kunene and Caprivi.⁵

Secondly, households usually have long-term strategies or more subtle criteria for making decisions, such as coping with drought, minimising risk, increasing resilience to outside shocks, and, more generally, diversification. The relevance of tourism to these priorities also needs to be considered. The fact that tourism income is not directly affected during drought years should be a major advantage to households in Namibia, where coping with drought is a constant concern, although this hypothesis has yet to be tested. Tourism also fits with the overall strategy of diversification, as it provides new economic opportunities in areas where there are few other non-agricultural options. On the other hand, tourism enterprises are often risky, involve a time-lag between investing and earning a return, and require collective action — all of which conflict with household strategies of minimising risk and investing in options that are flexible and convert labour and resources into cash relatively quickly.

4. Adapted from the 'sustainable rural livelihoods' framework of Carney, 1998; Scoones, 1998.

5. Data derived from project implementation experience, desk review for Caprivi drawing heavily on NGO material, and participatory research into wildlife options in Kunene.

Table 4
Possible conflicts and complementarities between tourism and other livelihood activities

	<i>Livestock</i>	<i>Crop cultivation</i>	<i>Waged employment</i>	<i>Harvesting tree/plant products</i>
Positive effects of tourism activities	Cash for investment Jobs near farms so employees can continue as farmers	Cash for investment	Good source of new jobs near home Skills gained in CBT are transferable	Improved community management of RNR
Negative effects of tourism activities	Livestock and wildlife compete for water and food Exclusive tourism/wildlife areas exclude livestock Tourist litter and resource damage affect livestock	Takes time, competes with crops in some seasons Crop damage by wildlife (elephants)	Some employment is seasonal	Competition for time People lose harvesting access in exclusive tourism areas

These indirect impacts of tourism have emerged as of great importance to community members in their planning and assessment of wildlife tourism, as examples from Torra conservancy show. Torra Conservancy is an arid area in Kunene Region, where pastoralism is the main land use. During participatory assessment of wildlife-development options with Torra farmers in 1997 (Croxtton, 1997; Ashley, 1997a), they emphasised that an important advantage of tourism is that the jobs are near home, which means those employed can continue as farmers. Given the remoteness of the area, virtually all other local employment options involve migrating to towns, leaving relatives or employees in charge of the herd. However, the competition for land and resources — particularly drought resources — between livestock and tourists or wildlife was also a prime concern. One of the reasons that an alternative, more lucrative joint venture tourism lodge was rejected by Torra members in 1996, was that the proposed exclusive tourism concession area included a spring used in drought, to which farmers would have lost access. Another reason was that it involved more risk, given the nature of the venture and lack of experience of the investor (Davis, 1998). Another intangible disadvantage is that tourists disturb elephants which then become more aggressive and dangerous. While the cost of this cannot be quantified (except in the number of deaths or injuries), it

is significant that this was ranked near the top of the disadvantages by all three groups of farmers involved in ranking exercises during participatory planning. In negotiations for the now established Damaraland Camp, committee members of Torra Conservancy (at the time, Ward 11 Residents Trust) negotiated harder to increase their partners' commitment to training than to increase the percentage revenue share (*ibid.*). These examples show how Torra members are assessing tourism options in terms of their impact on coping with drought, risk minimisation, livestock maintenance, security, and human resource development.

Trade-offs and livelihood priorities will inevitably differ across areas. In Caprivi, which has more water, wildlife and tourists than Kunene, the trade-offs with agriculture and food security focus less on drought resources for livestock and wildlife, and more on riverine resources and wildlife damage to crops. Trade-offs also vary between stakeholders, particularly between socio-economic groups and between men and women. For example, at Lianshulu Village, on the Kwando River in East Caprivi, the men wanted to develop a campsite on the river, but this would have caused problems for the women who gather reeds and water lilies there (Nabane, 1995).

Table 5 summarises the wide variety of livelihood impacts of tourism. It aggregates key issues for the two Regions, and across different types of stakeholders in order to show the range of issues involved. Some are only relevant to particular stakeholders, and/or in particular areas, and are far from inevitable, but they highlight the range of issues that need to be assessed with local residents during tourism planning.

Implications: The impacts of tourism on rural livelihoods will vary enormously under different agro-ecological and social conditions, and differ within a community between rich and poor, men and women, and other types of stakeholder groups. Enhancing the livelihood impact of tourism requires an understanding of the livelihood priorities of local residents, how different types of tourism can meet them, and how tourism affects other livelihood activities. With this understanding it is often possible to improve the livelihood impacts of an enterprise with negligible impact on financial arrangements — for example, by paying attention to training, siting, or security issues. Measures to reduce opportunity costs and other negative impacts (such as damage by wildlife and tourists) can be as useful as measures to enhance the direct benefits. However, adapting tourism in this way may also involve conflict and political processes. There are no universal rules except that participatory analysis of livelihood priorities and impacts and local-level decision-making are needed in order to guide the type of tourism development (again, within the constraints of financial profitability).

Table 5
Potential key impacts of tourism on livelihoods

<i>Livelihood objectives/concerns</i>	<i>Negative effects of tourism</i>	<i>Positive effects of tourism</i>
<i>Fulfillment of needs</i>		
Cash	Requires start-up investment	New earning opportunities from employment, casual sales, community contracts
Food	Wildlife damage to agriculture Lost access to veld foods in tourism areas	Food security via cash earnings of poor Improved collective resource management
Physical security	Disturbance of aggressive animals by tourists	
Cultural values	Intrusion of Western cultural values. Commercialisation of local culture	Spiritual value of wildlife. Revitalisation of traditional skills/culture for tourism
<i>Accumulation of assets</i>		
Natural resources	Increased competition for RNR of tourism value Loss of access to RNR in exclusive tourism areas Exacerbated conflict with neighbours affects RNR negotiation	Enhanced collective management Improved co-operation with neighbours affects RNR negotiation
Physical savings		Investment of tourism earnings in livestock
Financial assets		Long term: community equity in tourism
Social capital	Local conflicts over control of tourism assets	Stronger social organisation for tourism management
Human resources		Training, skill development
<i>Strategies/priorities</i>		
Cope with drought	Competition for drought resources (grazing, veld foods)	Income continues in drought
Diversify		An additional livelihood opportunity
Minimise risk	Risk: investment may fail; tourism may slump	
Maintain adaptability and flexibility	Earnings are lagged, requires high initial inputs: not flexible	

Conservation impact

Internationally, community-based conservation programmes rest on the principle that the benefits of wildlife to local people must exceed the costs, so as to provide incentives for local residents to manage resources sustainably (Steiner and Rihoy, 1995; IIED, 1994). In Namibia, community tourism is seen as the main way to generate financial benefits from wildlife, and hence encourage conservation. It is too early yet to measure changes in conservation behaviour or the status of the resource base, resulting from involvement in tourism (although changes due to involvement in the broader CBNRM programme, amongst other factors, have been observed in Kunene (Durbin et al., 1997; Jones, 1997)). However, some of the caveats and complexities in using tourism as a conservation incentive have already emerged. International experience has shown that simple summation of benefits and subtraction of costs is too simplistic in creating incentives, and that several other issues need to be taken into account, including the distribution of benefits across all resource users within a common property resource management regime; the establishment of a tangible link between wildlife and the benefit and a positive correlation between the scale of benefit and the quality of management; and non-financial incentives including proprietorship, responsibility and institutional capacity for natural resource management (Murphree, 1993; Steiner and Rihoy, 1995; Makombe, 1994; Jones, 1997).

This indicates three limitations of tourism⁶ in providing conservation incentives, each of which has emerged in Namibia:

First, financial incentives will be ineffective in the absence of *institutions* and *capacity* for sustainable management. Or, as Murphree (1994) puts it: 'Community based conservation in essence is about sustainable institutions'. This is why the Namibian programme has generally sought to enhance responsibility for wildlife and institutional capacity, before benefits flow, rather than vice versa (IRDNC, 1996; Jones, 1997).

Secondly, the *distribution* of local earnings from tourism is critical, because effective common property resource management depends on all members of the 'producer community' sharing in the benefits (Murphree, 1993). This highlights the advantages of joint ventures and revenue-sharing lodges because of the potential for income to be distributed to all members of the community, unlike

6. A fourth possible limitation, not yet addressed, is that even if tourism creates incentives for conservation of wildlife, this is not the same as maintenance of biodiversity or ecosystem sustainability. For example, evidence from commercial farms suggests that farmers are overstocking with wildlife (Barnes and de Jager, 1995). However, on communal land the synergy between wildlife and broader conservation goals may be greater, as one of the main means of local wildlife conservation is maintenance of habitat, including the core protected areas and rivers.

wages or informal sector earnings. However, there may still be a mismatch of *scale* between a community involved in a tourism venture and the 'producer community' sustaining wildlife habitat. Appropriately sized social units for operating tourism enterprises or joint ventures are generally smaller than the ecological units appropriate to arid areas with migratory wildlife (Jones, forthcoming). Communities and NGOs are devising ways to deal with this problem. For example, the Nyae Nyae Conservancy has developed a revenue-distribution plan to share earnings between those closely involved in an enterprise and those further away within the wildlife area. In both Kunene and Caprivi, bed-night levies from tourism lodges have been shared widely across several villages, in an attempt to reach the relevant producer communities. Nevertheless, there are likely to be situations where the community with the most scenic site (e.g., river access) establishes a lucrative tourism enterprise, while the surrounding communities who help sustain the wildlife on which the enterprise is based are excluded.

Thirdly, the *link* between tourism income and wildlife conservation is not always sufficiently tangible. Whereas income from hunting is clearly derived from wildlife, the link between wildlife and tourism income is not so evident. Staff involved in tourism enterprises no doubt understand that tourists come to enjoy wildlife but, in general, understanding of tourists is so low that the relative importance of cold drinks and luxurious facilities or the 'big five' (lion, leopard, elephant, rhino and buffalo) and endemic flora is not clear to the majority of the population. Furthermore, the effect of marginal changes in conservation behaviour on tourism income is too indirect and lagged. To address this problem, the link between wildlife conservation and tourism income has been strongly emphasised by NGOs, private operators and government officials at bed-night levy distribution ceremonies (Durbin et al., 1997), and by private operators in joint-venture negotiations.

This consideration of conservation impacts further emphasises the qualitative difference between a private lodge operating on communal land and lodges that share revenue or operate in partnership with communities, because of the latter's potential for generating benefits that can be widely shared and publicised as wildlife-related, and for stimulating positive institutional and social change. Nevertheless, even if this potential is realised, other preconditions for sustainable resource management by communities also need to be in place, which go beyond the scope of this assessment (see IIED, 1994; Ostrom, 1990; Steiner and Rihoy, 1995).

National strategies to promote community tourism

A wide variety of measures have been taken to promote community involvement in tourism, by the Namibian Government, NGOs, donors, and some in the

private sector. Two preconditions led to the emergence of this involvement. First, years of grassroots work on community management of wildlife by an NGO, IRDNC, which developed local institutions and interest in sustainable wildlife-utilisation, starting in Kunene Region in the early 1980s. Secondly, there was the development of the Conservancy policy to devolve conditional wildlife-use rights to communities registered as conservancies. Although this did not become legislation until late 1996, the acceptance of the policy in the early 1990s encouraged communities to start developing wildlife-utilisation options (Durbin et al., 1997).

By 1994, several communities in the CBNRM programme were developing an interest in tourism, private sector tourism activities were impinging on communal areas with wildlife, and economic research showed that non-consumptive tourism had the greatest potential for generating financial returns to wildlife for conservancies (Ashley et al., 1994; Ashley and Garland, 1994; Barnes, 1995). Partners in the CBNRM programme (including staff from the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET), several NGOs, the University of Namibia, and the USAID-funded WWF-US LIFE Programme) began to promote community tourism more proactively. However, several constraints were identified including:

- Community/local tourism enterprises lack capital, marketing skills and market information, and suffer from local conflicts, lack of tenure, and informal sector constraints.
- The private sector lacks incentives to enter partnerships with communities, and even for the minority who are interested, the transaction costs involved can be prohibitive. Communities approached by potential private sector partners lack information and negotiating skills.
- Despite government statements in favour of greater equity in the tourism industry, several policies inadvertently discourage the informal sector. There is also little government capacity for promoting community tourism, and no tradition or existing mechanisms for local participation in tourism planning.

Strategies to overcome these constraints included:

(i) *Promotion of community tourism enterprises*: NGOs have provided business advice and loans, while helping communities to access donor funding, workshops and other training, and enterprise advice from MET economists and other technical NGOs. MET and NGO staff help communities to apply for legal permission for business development ('Permission to Occupy' or PTO), and with increasing support for community tourism in the tourism planning system, many enterprises have gained PTOs. Government and NGOs organised the first

national workshop for community tourism enterprises which led the enterprises' representatives to establish their own association — the Namibian Community Based Tourism Association (NACOBTA).

(ii) *Promotion of community-private sector partnerships*: NGOs have facilitated joint-venture negotiation, with technical inputs from MET and non-profit lawyers. Exchange of ideas between communities, private operators and government was encouraged through a national ecotourism workshop and other information-sharing activities. There has also been concerted advocacy of proposed reform of tourism legislation to confirm the tourism concession rights of conservancies, and to amend the proposed land reform to grant communities group tenure, in ways compatible with community tourism rights. Either or both of these reforms would greatly enhance the market power of communities, and the incentives of private operators to enter partnerships.

(iii) *Enhanced capacity in government*: The Tourism White Paper, drawn up in 1993, contained several statements on the importance of broadening the distribution of the benefits of tourism, as did the First National Development Plan (NPC, 1995). However, long-standing tourism staff and conventional tourism consultants had few ideas on how to put such ideas into practice. To enhance capacity, there has been a Community Tourism Officer within the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (seconded by the LIFE Programme) since 1994, with specific responsibility to provide support to communities engaging in tourism while ensuring that community perspectives are taken into account inside the Ministry. Further posts are included in staffing plans.

(iv) *Reform of policy and planning*: Promoters of community tourism helped to identify areas where policy constraints needed to be removed or incentives created. Three key issues emerged as critical: removal of unintentional obstacles to local involvement created by regulations and procedures (e.g., for registration of guides and accommodation facilities,⁷ and for obtaining PTOs); use of planning gain to prevent private enterprises operating on communal land without obtaining permission from, or sharing benefits with, local residents; and

7. Regulations for the registration of tourism accommodation facilities and tourism guides set standards well above the minimum required for health and safety, and therefore constrain community involvement in tourism. For example, the lowest category of accommodation facility required 5 bedrooms with modern plumbing, so there was no category suitable for bed and breakfast 'home stays'. Similarly, there was one training and qualification procedure to become a tourism guide, with training in English, in Windhoek, in all aspects of guiding such as driving and first aid. This would be inappropriate to rural residents wanting to act as local guides, interpreting their own local knowledge for tourists. The government is now developing tourism accommodation grades that include community campsites and home stays and regulations for different types of guides.

devolution of tourism concession rights to conservancies, in the absence of land tenure.

(v) *Mechanisms for ongoing assessment, adaptation and promotion of local interests:* As there is no blueprint for locally appropriate tourism to be implemented instantaneously, a priority has been to establish mechanisms for community interests in tourism to develop and adapt. These include development of government capacity in community tourism (see point iii), support for NACOBTA as a voice for community interests, and specifically a place for it on the proposed Namibia Tourism Board, local participation in local/regional tourism and land-use planning, ongoing research on community tourism and its livelihood impacts, and collaboration with a widening group of NGOs and development agencies on tourism issues.

Some key features of the Namibian situation underlying these strategies are worth noting. The first is heterogeneity within government. While the pre-independence bureaucracy remains largely in place, it is now possible for more progressive 'change agents' within government to introduce new policies. A handful of civil servants, working closely with NGOs, have been able to promote policy statements and implementation in support of community tourism. This has led to rapid changes in government policy, but has created tensions with the slower pace of change in the wider bureaucracy. For the SWAPO Government, tourism development fits with the macroeconomic strategy of market-led growth and long-term diversification away from rent-based industries, while community involvement fits with the post-independence goal of spreading the benefits of growth. However, other more important priorities generate constraints. Within the tourism sector, the focus is on trying to define appropriate roles for government and private sector, and on national tourism promotion. Community involvement is a minor aspect. In other Ministries, continuing uncertainty about communal land reform, absence of land-use planning, and a strong emphasis on agricultural intensification as the main rural development and food security strategy, conflict with the promotion of community tourism. Community tourism remains marginal for the majority of professionals concerned with rural development, because it has little relevance in the most densely populated Owambo areas and most potential in the more remote (geographically and politically) northwest and northeast.

Progress is therefore mixed. The rights of communities to control tourist access or offer a partner exclusive tourism rights are still not confirmed, because of long delays in finalising tourism legislation and land reform. For every community enterprise which is successful — the first of which are now emerging — there are more that still lack credit, markets and skills. Many favourable policy reforms (for example, see Table 6 in the next section), such as using National Parks as a motor of local development, can be identified but

are not yet being implemented. Thus most of the constraints on community tourism listed above persist to some degree. Nevertheless, the inter-agency strategy outlined here has facilitated the range of enterprises described earlier, including joint ventures and bed-night levies, and a host of community enterprises such that NACOBTA's membership has doubled from about 15 to over 30. These enterprises, in turn, have provided practical demonstrations of a new approach, have helped to change assumptions about community involvement in tourism among practitioners and have won praise and attention from leading politicians.

Implications for policy

Two key principles emerge from Namibia's experience. First, if the aim is to promote development in rural areas, blanket promotion of tourism is not the most appropriate strategy. Positive developmental impact can be enhanced by differentiating between types of tourism, and then assessing and adapting them with respect to local livelihoods. Secondly, community involvement in tourism does not only depend on what communities themselves do. National policy and intervention by governmental and non-governmental actors can strongly affect the type of tourism and its impact locally.

Within these two guiding principles, further policy implications emerge, as discussed below. More detail of policies which promote or hinder community involvement in tourism is shown in Table 6, which is drawn from a combination of Namibian and other southern African experience.

(i) *What form of tourism to promote?* To maximise development impact it is necessary to assess the range of costs and benefits generated by different types of enterprises. These should not just be assessed according to the amount of local income generated, but also according to the distribution of that income, social and institutional benefits, complementarities or conflicts with other livelihood strategies, and local costs incurred. A combination of enterprises (run by local residents and outside investors, plus informal sector activities) is likely to be appropriate, and in all cases financial viability is a prerequisite. But distinctions should be drawn between operations run independently by an outside investor and those with a voluntary or contractual partnership locally. The latter can generate different types and wider distribution of benefits, as well as providing a greater cash injection locally. However, they can also incur higher costs for residents, including investment of time and risk. Locally run enterprises generate very little financial income by comparison, but can nevertheless provide a good return on a limited investment and catalyse other changes.

Table 6
Government policies that help and hinder community involvement in tourism

	<i>Policies that help</i>	<i>Policies that hinder</i>
Tenure	Community tenure over land, wildlife and/or tourism rights	No rights to utilise wildlife nor to charge tourists/private operators for enjoying tourism attractions in the area
Tourism planning and policy	Clear policy statement in support of community involvement Local participation in tourism planning Community involvement and benefit a key criterion in government planning decisions on formal sector tourism. Enclave tourism discouraged A planning system for approving new tourism enterprises that is easy for rural people to use	CBT ignored in government policies Plans of big operators given priority over community developments Operators able to get planning approval with no discussion of community benefits Urgent deadlines take priority over community consultation and development Applications for planning approval too difficult for rural people to use
Tourism marketing	Marketing of community enterprises by national tourism marketing body Emphasis on cultures and people in national marketing, not only on wildlife/wilderness Providing market information to community enterprises	Marketing focuses only on the 'big five' and big companies No information on community enterprises in government information
Tourism regulation/standards	Regulations that allow for simple tourism enterprise, within limits of health and safety, eg category of 'home-accommodation' or 'basic campsite' with simpler standards than other types of enterprise Registration system accessible to rural residents Regulations for larger ventures that encourage or require measures to enhance local benefits	A grading system with no 'basic' grades or categories suitable for community campsites, home-stay arrangements, etc. Minimum standards too high for most informal and community enterprises to reach (ie above basic health and safety requirements) Difficult and expensive procedures, requiring access to capital city, language skills and money

Land-use planning	Planning that incorporates community views, recognises tourism as a land use, supports multiple land uses and discourages enclave tourism	No land-use planning. Or planning that ignores local views and ignores tourism as a land user and links with other sectors
Tourism training and licensing	Capacity building for rural residents, organised or sponsored by government Courses, exams and licences that are accessible to local people and provide qualifications appropriate for local enterprises, eg locally-run courses to be registered as a local guide	Developed only for educated urbanites. Only one (high and expensive) category of qualification
Joint ventures between community and private sector	Supportive policy Regulations/tenure arrangements that give power to communities Government recognition of community institutions with legal powers to enter contracts	No incentive for companies to negotiate with communities No governmental recognition of joint venture arrangements
Micro and small enterprises	Policies to maximise economic linkages between tourism sector and local enterprises, eg through credit, training, joint planning	Assuming local enterprise links will just emerge with no help
Information, staffing and extension	Community Tourism Officers or other staff providing information and advice (including enterprise development and social organisation) to community enterprises Information provided to formal sector on how to work with communities and enhance local benefits	Only conventional staff trained in planning and marketing, with no community development skills or understanding. Information only available in the capital, no translations
Park pricing and development	Parks run in ways that stimulate enterprise opportunities for neighbours (eg craft market, local guides, taxis) Providing park visitors with information on local enterprises Complementary rather than competitive enterprise development inside park Giving neighbouring community a tourism concession inside park	Undercutting accommodation outside park by subsidised prices inside Undermining community ventures outside by maximising development at prime sites inside

Credit, tax, incentives	Access to credit for small enterprises	Credit only available to large firms. Taxes/subsidies that encourage capital investment rather than labour-intensive enterprises
Overall approach	Supportive attitudes in government Allowing time for communities to develop tourism Creating opportunities and removing constraints, rather than planning community tourism for them Recognition of multiple livelihood objectives, not just maximising cash income Enhancement of local residents' power in tourism market Regulations that encourage rather than exclude informal sector NGO facilitation welcomed	Ignoring community tourism Or government trying to do everything at once to establish community enterprises, without allowing time for local people to develop ideas and skills

Source: Drawing on experience in Namibia and other southern African countries.

(ii) *Enhancing financial impacts*: Joint ventures between communities and private operators are likely to generate the largest cash injection into the local economy. Governments can encourage these by giving communities market power, through devolution of tenure or tourism rights, or through use of planning gain to oblige private operators to work in partnership. Facilitation of negotiation and partnership, by NGOs or government, is also important.

Enhancing the financial earnings of *poorer* community members can be done in two ways. First, by promoting informal sector activities and their linkages with the formal sector. The potential for multiplying local linkages is generally under-explored, but can be encouraged by governments through their own procurement policies in parks and tourism enterprises, in decisions on the location of tourism enterprises and infrastructure that would enhance local market access, and through the use of planning gain to encourage private operators to maximise local procurement and employment. A second way is to increase income that is earned collectively (as opposed to individually) and is shared across the community as a household dividend. This depends on developing the market power of collective institutions and on facilitating transparent and equitable distribution. In Namibia, the latter has been done — relatively successfully — by NGOs.

(iii) *Enhancing social impacts*: Tourism can provide a catalyst for communities to strengthen local institutions, improve decision-making processes, and resolve

conflicts. This has occurred in Namibia largely because it has been promoted by local NGOs with an emphasis on institution building and adaptive management, and this process approach has been supported by key government officials. Institution building and local decision-making are encouraged by giving communities a stake in local tourism decisions and adapting the pace and scale of developments to community processes. However, the process of change can be negative as well as positive. In particular, competition for tourism resources can exacerbate local conflicts, and conflict-avoidance skills can be invaluable in minimising these social costs.

A different type of social benefit from tourism is human resource development. Lack of investment in tourism training for local residents is a classic case of market failure, which government, NGOs, or donors are well placed to fill. In Namibia, they are all struggling to fill the training gap, but the fact that communities are using their negotiating power in joint venture agreements to enhance private sector training provision shows the importance of this to rural residents.

(iv) *Enhancing livelihood impacts*: Ensuring that tourism enhances livelihood security requires recognition that local needs are not just cash maximisation and that local livelihoods depend on multiple activities. The aim should be to shape tourism so that it meets a range of local livelihood needs and complements rather than conflicts with other activities. This requires an understanding of the livelihood priorities of local residents, how different types of tourism can meet them, and how tourism affects other livelihood activities, and means giving residents themselves the chance to assess and choose tourism options. Useful methods need to be developed, but key components include participatory planning and livelihood analysis, recognition of differences between stakeholders, a focus on minimising trade-offs rather than just maximising benefits, and a tourism planning system that accommodates local decisions.

(v) *Maximising conservation impacts*: It is important to recognise that conservation and development goals may overlap but emphasise different concerns. If tourism's financial or development benefits to local residents are to be effective conservation incentives, they must be widely distributed to reach (virtually) all resource users, on a scale appropriate to resource or ecosystem maintenance, they must be secure for the long term, and they must be tangibly linked to the resource. Furthermore, incentives are likely to be necessary but not sufficient, as development of capacity and some form of proprietorship or responsibility are needed, and conflicts that undermine sustainable management must be addressed.

(vi) *Overall approach: role of government and other partners*: Governments cannot simply implement a blueprint for community tourism, but there are a

number of measures that can be taken to support it. A policy statement specifically in support of community tourism proved an invaluable step in Namibia, providing momentum and confidence in a process of change. It has also been as important to remove constraints as to create new incentives. While many measures are possible to support community enterprises and encourage community-private sector partnerships, some of these are better done by NGOs and others, with support from government. It is important to engage a range of agencies and sectors, and develop complementary roles. Training and facilitation may be better done by NGOs, and investment by the private sector, but governments can encourage these by endorsing training opportunities and reducing investment risk. Two critical steps that only government can take are: to devolve tenure, or some form of proprietorship, over tourism assets to local residents, in a way that complements the land tenure system; and secondly to use the planning system to give communities access to tourism opportunities and a voice in decision-making, and use planning gain to encourage private operators to enhance local benefits and participation.

The Namibian experience shows that community tourism can evolve rapidly, and can generate a range of financial, social and livelihood benefits for communities, as well as problems. The impacts vary according to the type of enterprise development, the local context, and the opportunities for local residents to shape tourism to their needs and priorities. Promoting community participation in, and benefit from, tourism is therefore quite different from blanket promotion of tourism in rural areas. Within the constraints of maintaining financial viability, an adaptive approach that builds on local priorities is needed.

References

- ART (Africa Resources Trust) (1998) Report of a Workshop on Community Tourism in Southern Africa. Harare: Africa Resources Trust, on behalf of SADC Wildlife Sector Technical Co-ordination Unit.
- ART (forthcoming) *What Governments can do for Community Tourism*. Guidance leaflet 4 in Community Tourism, written by Caroline Ashley for Africa Resources Trust (draft).
- Ashley, C. (1995) *Tourism, Communities, and Potential Impacts on Local Incomes and Conservation*. Research Discussion Paper No. 10. Windhoek: Directorate of Environmental Affairs (DEA), MET.
- Ashley, C. (1997a) *Feedback from Meetings in Bergsig Area Exploring Wildlife, Livestock and Livelihoods*. WILD Development Phase. Windhoek: DEA, MET.

- Ashley C. (1997b) *Summary Report from Fieldwork at Grootberg and Bergsig*. WILD Development Phase. Windhoek: DEA, MET.
- Ashley, C. (1998) *Intangibles Matter: Non-financial Dividends of Community-Based Natural Resource Management in Namibia*. Windhoek: LIFE Programme.
- Ashley, C., Barnes, J. and Healy, T. (1994) *Profits, Equity, Growth and Sustainability: The Economic Potential of Wildlife Enterprises in Caprivi and Other Communal Areas of Namibia*. Research Discussion Paper No. 2. Windhoek: DEA, MET.
- Ashley, C. and Garland, E. (1994) *Community-based Tourism: Why, What and How?* Research Discussion Paper No. 4. Windhoek: DEA, MET.
- Ashley, C. and LaFranchi, C. (1997) *Livelihood Strategies of Rural Households in Caprivi: Implications for Conservancies and Natural Resource Management*. DEA Research Discussion Paper No. 20. Windhoek: DEA, MET.
- Barnes, J.I. (1995) *The Value of Non-Agricultural Resource Use in Some Namibian Communal Areas: A Database for Planning*. Research Discussion Paper No. 6. Windhoek: DEA, MET.
- Barnes, J.I. and de Jager, J.L.V. (1995) *Economic and Financial Incentives for Wildlife Use on Private Land in Namibia and Implications for Policy*. Research Discussion Paper No. 8. Windhoek: DEA, MET.
- Berger, D.J. (1996) 'The Challenge of Integrating Masai Tradition with Tourism' in M. Price (ed.) *People and Tourism in Fragile Environments*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
- Blench, R. (1998) *Fragments and Sentiments: Why is 'the Community' the Focus of Development?* Agricultural Research and Extension Network (AGREN) Paper. London: Overseas Development Institute, January.
- Bond, I. (1996) 'Benefit Distribution in CAMPFIRE and Producer Communities and Private Sector Negotiations: the Experience of the CAMPFIRE Programme'. Paper for workshop on benefits and joint ventures, LIFE Programme, Windhoek.
- Brandon, K. and Wells, M. (1992) *People and Parks: Linking Protected Area Management with Local Communities*. Washington, DC: World Bank, WWF, USAID.
- Brown, K., Turner, R.K., Hameed, H. and Bateman, I. (1995) *Tourism and Sustainability in Environmentally Fragile Areas: Case Studies from the Maldives and Nepal*. CSERGE Working Paper GEC 95-30. Norwich and London: Centre for Social and Economic Research on the Global Environment.
- Carney, D. (ed.) (1998) *Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: What Contribution Can We Make?* London: Department for International Development.

- Croxton, S. (1997) *Methods Used and Methodology Lessons Learnt during Fieldwork of the Development Phase*. WILD Development Phase. Windhoek: DEA, MET.
- Davis, A. (1996) 'Etendeka Bed Night Levy Distribution'. Presentation to a workshop on benefits and joint ventures, LIFE Programme, Windhoek.
- Davis, A. (1998) 'Community Experience of Partnerships. Namibian Experience: A Case Study'. Presentation to Regional Workshop on Community Tourism in Southern Africa, ART and SADC NRMP, Windhoek, January.
- De Beer, G. and Elliffe, S. (1997) *Tourism Development and the Empowerment of Local Communities*. Working Paper 11, DPRU Industrial Strategy Project. Cape Town: University of Cape Town.
- Durbin, J., Jones, B.T.B. and Murphree, M. (1997) *Namibian Community-based Natural Resource Management Programme: Project Evaluation*, for IRDNC and WWF, Windhoek.
- Elliffe, S.P., Rutsch, P. and de Beer, G.M. (1998) *Allocating Community Benefits: Institutional Options in Support of Empto-tourism Models*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town.
- FAO (1992) *Northern Livestock Improvement Project: Socio-Economic and Production Systems Diagnostic Study*. Rome: FAO/IFAD Co-operative Programme.
- Goodwin, H.J., Kent, I.J., Parker, K.T., and Walpole, M.J. (1997) *Tourism, Conservation and Sustainable Development, Vol. 1, Comparative Report*. London: DFID.
- Healy, (1994) 'Tourist Merchandise as a Means of Generating Local Benefits from Tourism'. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 2(3).
- IIED (1994) *Whose Eden? An Overview of Community Approaches to Wildlife Management*. London: International Institute for Environment and Development.
- IRDNC (1996) *Namibia: WWFNA0004 Technical Report to BMZ*. Windhoek: IRDNC.
- Jones, B.T.B. (1997) 'Community-based Natural Resource Management in Botswana and Namibia: An Inventory and Preliminary Analysis of Progress. Paper for 'Evaluating Eden' project of IIED.
- Jones, B.T.B. (forthcoming) 'From Poachers to Proprietors: Lessons Learned from a Community-based Conservation Project, Kunene Region, Namibia'. Draft working paper of 'Community Conservation in Africa, Principles and Comparative Practice' Project of Manchester University, UK.
- Koch, (1994) *Reality or Rhetoric: Ecotourism and Rural Reconstruction in South Africa*. Discussion Paper DP54. Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.
- Makombe, K. (1994) *Sharing the Land*. Harare: IUCN/ROSA.
- Ministry of Environment and Tourism (1992) *Namibia's Green Plan*. Edited by C.J.Brown. Windhoek: MET.

- Morris-Jarra, M. (1996) 'No Such Thing as a Cheap Holiday' in *In Focus*. London: Tourism Concern.
- Murphree, M.W. (1993) *Communities as Resource Management Institutions*. Gatekeeper Series No. 36. London: IIED.
- Murphree, M.W. (1994) 'The Role of Institutions in Community-Based Conservation', in D. Western and M. Wright (eds) *Natural Connections: Perspectives in Community-Based Conservation*. New York: Island Press.
- Nabane, N. (1995) *Gender as a Factor in Community-based Natural Resource Management: a Case Study of Nongozi, Lianshulu, Lizauli, and Sichona Villages in East Caprivi*. Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Zimbabwe, submitted to LIFE Programme, Windhoek.
- NPC (1995) *Namibia's First National Development Plan*. Windhoek: NPC.
- Ostrom, E. (1990) *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scoones, I. (1998) *Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: A Framework for Analysis*. Working Paper No. 72. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex.
- Scoones, I. et al. (1996) *Hazards and Opportunities: Farming Livelihoods in Dryland Africa — Lessons from Zimbabwe*. London and Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Zed Books in association with IIED.
- Steiner, A. and Rihoy, E. (1995) 'The Commons Without the Tragedy' in *The Commons without the Tragedy, Strategies for Community Based Natural Resource Management in Southern Africa*. Proceedings of the Regional Natural Resource Management Programme Annual Conference. SADC Wildlife Technical Co-ordination Unit, Lilongwe.
- Sullivan, S. (1996) *The Communalisation of Former Commercial Farmland: Perspectives from Damaraland and Implications for Land Reform*. Social Sciences Division (Research Report No. 25). Windhoek: Multi-Disciplinary Research Center, University of Namibia.
- Ward, P. (1997) *Brief Precipis of the Damaraland Camp Project*. Windhoek: Wilderness Safaris.
- Wyckoff-Baird, B. (1995) *Direct Economic Benefits from Wildlife Management: The Bed Night Levy in East Caprivi; Bushmen Promote Unique Tourism Opportunities by Capitalizing on their Extensive Knowledge of the Natural Environment*. Information boxes prepared for LIFE Programme, Windhoek.