

Proceedings of the Fourth National CBNRM Forum meeting in Gaborone, Botswana 12th of June 2003

Including:

- **The 2002 - 2006 DWNP/EU Community Development Fund criteria and funding strategy**
- **Case study on the financial management problems in Khwai**
- **Exploring options on how to improve financial management at community level in CBNRM**

The fourth National CBNRM Forum meeting and this report was co-funded by GEF – Small Grants Projects and the CBNRM Support Programme

© National CBNRM Forum, June 2003

Contents

- Proceedings of the Fourth National CBNRM Forum Meeting the 12th of June 2003 (page 3)
- Strategy and Criteria for Funding of Proposals for Community-based Projects under the Community Development Fund (CDF) (Annex 1, page 21)
- Organisation of rural economic development at community level, Report from BOCOBONET (Annex 2, page 26)
- Khwai Development Trust – A Short Case Study by Frank Potts of Eco-tourism Support Services in Maun (Annex 3, page 27)
- Recent decision of DWNP to (temporarily) withhold the quota 2003 of some communities! The result of poor financial management in CBNRM at community level and the need to address this. Discussion paper by the CBNRM Support Programme, 15th of May 2003 (Annex 4, page 38)
- CBNRM Issues in Northwest District to be taken from the April 2003 District CBNRM Forum meeting in Maun to the National CBNRM Forum (annex 5, page 43)
- Money makes the world go round (MMTWGR). A concept paper on the development of financial expertise within a Community Based Organisation and the support needed to achieve sound financial management. The example of the Gaing-O-Community Trust by Stefan Ille (Annex 6, page 45)

**Proceedings of the fourth
National CBNRM Forum Meeting
Thursday the 12th of June 2003, 8.00 AM
Venue: President Hotel, Gaborone**

Members present:

ARB	B. Nsoso
ARB	B.L. Maswabi
ARB	H.B. Madisa
BOCOBONET	R. Magweregwe
BOCOBONET	D.S. Lecholo
BWMA	D. Peake
Chobe Wildlife Trust	M. Shamukuni
Conservation International	S. Sainsbury
DWNP Gaborone	O. Kgathi
DWNP Gaborone	P. Jibajiba
DWNP Gaborone	M. Mogorosi
DWNP Gaborone	ES Gobuamang
DWNP Francistown	M. Kgomo
DWNP Maun	E.T. Mvimi
ESS	F. Potts (Ngamiland CBNRM Forum, Chairman)
K.C.S.	F. Monggae
K.C.S.	N. Vogt
MFDPRDCD	S. Baruti
National Museum	G. Siphambe
Permaculture Trust	R. Clark
Permaculture Trust	G. Tapeng
TAC Chobe	R. Dumedisang
TAC Ghanzi	K. Lefenya
TAC Kgalagadi	G.G. Seporogwane
Thusano Lefatsheng	F. Nkani
VPR&D	D. Thamage
Luzwe Dev. Trust	O. Galebole
Kgetse ya tsie	K. Bafana
Sankuyo TMT	K Ntongwane
Nata Sanctuary	E. German
CECT (CH1/2)	L.M. Kashweeka
Kgobokanyo Development Trust	K. Puleng
Koinaphu	H. Titus
Botlale ya Phale	C. Nthai
Ikemeleng Producers Co-operative	O. Molotlhanyi

Secretariat:

CBNRM Support Programme (recording)	N. Rozemeijer
DoT (Chairman)	W. Tema
IUCN (recording)	C. Wirbelauer

Observers:

Action for Economic Empowerment Trust	P. Kereng
Africa Development Foundation	H. Bowie
Blackbeard and Hepburn Safaris	R. Blackbeard
Consultant	R. Jansen
Centre for Applied Research	J. Arntzen
Centre for Applied Research	K. Molokomme
DED	C. De Wolf
Dept. of Fisheries	T.G. Mmopelwa
Dept. of Forestry	K. S. Kemoreile
DWNP/Darudec	K. Mpofu
EU	M. Pambianco
GEF/SGP	I. Pilane
HOORC	B.N. Ngwenya
IRDP	A. Mabei

IUCN/CEM
Khwai Dev. Trust
Mababe CDT
NWDC – Tourism
Roskilde Univ. (Denmark)
Roskilde Univ. (Denmark)
UNDP
UNDP
WAFABO

B. Dithapo
K. Ntsogotho
M. Mogodu
M. Malesu
P. Dalsgaard
T. Christensen
M. Flyman
L. Dikobe
U. Nermark

Apologies

USAID

M. Nanchengwa

Agenda:

- 8:00-8:30 Registration
- 8:30-8:40 Welcome by the Chairman
- 8:40-9:00 Recap of the last National CBNRM Forum meeting in Mogoditshane dd. 11th of July 2002
- 9:00-9:30 National CBNRM Forum action items
- 9:30-10:00 Presentation of the EU funded Wildlife Conservation and Management Programme (2002-2006) – Community Development Fund (CDF)
- 10:00-10:30 *Tea break*
- 10:30-11:00 Community Based Strategy (RDCCD)

On the problems around community management of CBNRM funds and towards possible solutions

- 11:00-12:00 Case study on Khwai
- 11:00-12:45 Presentation of discussion paper
- 12:45-14:00 *Lunch*
- 14:00-15:00 Discussion in groups (Cancelled)
- 15:00-15:15 *Tea break*
- 15:15-16:00 Plenary debate and the way forward
- 16:00-16:30 Any other CBNRM-related comments and announcements (Cancelled, but see reports in annexes 5 and 6)
- Closing Remarks

Welcome by the Chairman

The main theme of the meeting is about the financial management problems experienced in communities involved in CBNRM. It has become very clear that (financial management) skills need to be built at CBO level but also that more control mechanisms need to be introduced to ensure full accountability. A related concern that needs to be addressed is about the status of photographic tourism concessions that were recently handed over to communities (NG24, NG17 and NG19). What did the communities of Jao, Sankuyo and Khwai do with these concessions and valuable infrastructure that were handed over to them? The concessions are not managed properly. Worse, they are vandalised. But did we expect these communities to turn into capable tourism operators just like that? Who prepared the CBOs for these responsibilities? We cannot put all the blame on the failing communities. We all failed!

We have to learn from these experiences and forge ahead. We, the stakeholders, should be proactive in learning and correcting where necessary also to avoid unilateral decision from the Government. We need to face the question on how to improve the performance of CBOs and the limited impact of CBNRM on household level. We need to address this to regain momentum and political support and we need to do that fast.

This topic will be elaborated after the presentation of a case study on Khwai. It should be emphasised that the Khwai case offers us a possibility to learn from their experiences, to start the debate on how to improve upon CBNRM in general and to help the community of Khwai (and others) to improve their financial management practices. It is definitely not the intention in this meeting to single out Khwai and accuse them of alleged wrongdoings. It is extremely courageous and commendable that the Khwai community, assisted by Eco-tourism Support Services in Maun, is willing to share their experiences and to explain to us what steps they have taken to alleviate their problems.

The National Review of CBNRM has started in May 2003. The National CBNRM Forum has secured the funding for this exercise. Stakeholder workshops will be organised later this year and the Forum will make sure that all stakeholders will be given the opportunity to air their views. The consultants are present here today and will briefly introduce themselves later.

There will be a National CBNRM Conference later this year (October or November). Members are invited to help the steering committee and the secretariat with ideas on themes, venues and special CBNRM-related activities.

For any CBNRM-related comments or announcements there is an opportunity to make them at the end of today's meeting. We have 2 issues already: a report from the District CBNRM Forum in Ngamiland (see annex to these minutes) and a question about the need to identify a national Very Important Person (VIP) to play the role of "Champion of Natural Resources Management" in Botswana. Is there need for such a person and who could be requested to take up that honour? Start thinking!

Recap of the last National CBNRM Forum meeting in Mogoditshane dd. 11th of July 2002 by Mr. W. Tema of Department of Tourism

The meeting in Mogoditshane on the 11th of July 2002 discussed the following items:

- A report on the follow-up of the 2001 National CBNRM Conference recommendations and action items was presented. An updated report is on the agenda today;
- The Department of Tourism informed the Forum on the 2002 International Year of Eco-tourism and the then planned celebrations at the Moremi Gorge project;
- BOCOBONET explained their participation in the 4-corners project in northern Botswana implemented through the African Wildlife Foundation (AWF);
- Veld Products Research & Development (VPR&D) presented their programme in Kweneng West;
- The African Development Foundation (ADF) presented its renewed project funding mechanism; and

- The final draft of the reviewed Joint Venture Guidelines was presented, discussed and approved. The finalised Guidelines were submitted to the Director of Wildlife and National Parks in the same month and since then discussed at Department level. We were lately informed that the DWNP intends to finalise the consultation process with a last round at District Council and Land Board level and it aims to introduce the new Guidelines in 2004.

Action items of the National CBNRM Forum by Mr. F. Monggae of the Kalahari Conservation Society

The recommendations made in the November 2001 National CBNRM Conference have been translated into action items and are followed-up by the steering committee of the National CBNRM Forum. This report briefs on the progress made since the July 2002 National CBNRM Forum meeting in Mogoditshane and the October 2002 steering committee meeting.

Action Item 1

The CBNRM Support Programme to explore ways to improve communication flow between the Private Sector and other stakeholders. Perhaps this could be done during the imminent CBNRM Review.

Apart from BWMA and HATAB playing more active roles in recent CBNRM-related meetings, BWMA is funding a community-based wildlife monitoring programme as well as financially contributing to the compilation of the 2003 CBNRM Status Report. HATAB has shown interest in becoming more involved in community-based tourism in Botswana. Their exact role and future plans in this regard need more discussion.

Action Item 2

DWNP should consider waiving or introducing other measures to deal with the obligation of those communities who manage CHAs to pay for licences for subsistence use.

The problem is as follows: In October 2001 new licence fees were introduced. These fees make hunting for subsistence purposes very expensive (e.g. 300 Pula for a gemsbok). By law the communities that receive a community quota on a Directors Permit have to pay the single game licence fees for those animals they decide to use for subsistence purposes. For the animals sold to the Safari Company, the company pays for the licences. Those communities earning a lot of money from the joint venture (in the elephant range) can afford to buy the licences on behalf of members and distribute them. Not all the "rich" trusts do this. The poor ones in Kgalagadi and Ghanzi do not earn enough to do this. The result is that poor community members (in most cases the previous holders of Special Game Licences - SGL) can not hunt anymore for subsistence use (or hunt illegally).

Administratively DWNP seems "to forget" to charge poor communities in Kgalagadi and Ghanzi for their licences but this cannot be a sustainable option.

It must be reminded that trusts (as per 1995 Savingram and per draft Policy) have an obligation to cater for the interests of poor (ex-SGL holders). Due to the 2001 hike in licence fees some trusts have no way of honouring this commitment. When DWNP cannot legally waive paying for licences the system works against the poorest community members who to an extent still depend on natural resources. They have lost individual access to wildlife over the years and "community benefits" from CBNRM might not be enough to compensate for this loss. Is this acceptable or should specific support mechanisms be developed? Who should look into this?

Action Item 3

BOCOBONET and BOCONGO should meet to finalise the proposed "Partnership Guidelines".

In the past communities were sometimes confused about the different roles between BOCOBONET and facilitating NGOs. This resulted in conflicts between BOCOBONET and NGOs with the communities caught in the middle. A first attempt was made by BOCOBONET to regulate the role of the NGO in a "Memorandum of Agreement". The NGOs were not involved in this process and BOCOBONET was asked and agreed in the November 2001 CBNRM Conference to consult with NGOs in preparing what was more like a "Partnership Agreement" between NGO and CBO.

A new draft was prepared but personnel turnover at BOCOBONET resulted in the proposed meeting not taking place yet. This will be done as soon as possible.

Action Item 4

It was agreed that BOCOBONET and the CBNRM Support Programme should come up with a concept paper on marketing aspects.

BOCOBONET collaboration with the Integrated Rural Development Project (IRDP) has resulted in a pilot project proposal in Kweneng to support rural economic development by establishing Community Trading Centres in villages. A summary of this project proposal submitted to the Kellogg Foundation is provided by BOCOBONET in the annexes to these minutes.

Action Item 5

IUCN and the CBNRM Support Programme to collate summarised information on the most relevant CBNRM issues pertaining to land and to circulate this to all forum members for comments before presentation to Land Policy Review consultants.

Inputs into the Land Policy Review were made by various organisations during workshops organised by the consultants. There was no time in that process to organise a joint CBNRM-related statement. What was asked was therefore unfortunately not done.

Action Item 6

To undertake a national review of CBNRM in Botswana

The review has started the 1st of May 2003 after all preparations were made and funding from DfID and the CBNRM Support Programme secured. The Centre for Applied Research in Gaborone has won the tender and has started the consultations. In the process there will be 1 national and 3 district stakeholder workshops (Kgalagadi, Central and Ngamiland). The review is guided by an all-stakeholder Review Reference Committee (RRC). The final report is due in September. Stakeholders have been informed through a newspaper article in the Mmegi, the IUCN newsletter, e-mailings and inclusion on the web sites of IUCN and CBNRM Support Programme. The Secretariat will continue to give regular feedback on the national review of CBNRM to all stakeholders in Botswana and beyond.

The review is expected to feed into the finalisation of the CBNRM Policy. DWNP informed the RRC that Government will step up its CBNRM Policy consultation process among Land Boards and District Councils. The aim is a finalised policy to Parliament towards the end of the year.

The consultants (The Centre for Applied Research) were given the floor to introduce themselves to the meeting and to give a briefing on the status of the exercise. It was explained that the consultation through interviews and workshops will be supplemented with case studies in Khwai, Sankuyo, KD1 and Kgetsya-Tsie. Specific attention will also be given to 2 NGOs (KCS and Thusano Lefatsheng) and 2 private sector companies (HCH and Rann Safaris). Also questionnaires will be distributed and participants were encouraged to contact the consultants.

Participants commented on the 4 CBO case studies chosen by the RRC and suggested that instead of studying two single village CBOs from Ngamiland (Sankuyo/Khwai) one multi-village CBO should be chosen for Ngamiland and one single village for Kgalagadi as the dynamics of single and multi-village CBOs can be very different. In order to avoid misunderstandings RRC members explained the criteria followed for the selection of the case studies and the chairman asked the consultants and the RRC to solve/discuss the issue during tea time.

Action Item 7

A breakfast meeting with the Parliamentary Committee on Environment and Agriculture should be requested to inform Parliamentarians on CBNRM and on the need for a CBNRM Policy.

The meeting took place in February 2003 and was organised by Thusano Lefatsheng, KCS, IUCN and the CBNRM Support Programme. The present 6 Parliamentarians were impressed and are expected to contribute to informed discussion when the CBNRM Policy is debated in Parliament.

Action Item 8

That the series of newspaper articles on CBNRM in Botswana be prepared by the CBNRM Support Programme and published in local newspapers.

Three articles informing the public on CBNRM were published in the Mmegi in November 2002 (Diamonds do not eat goats), December 2002 (Earning money from birds and beetles) and March 2003 (about old trees and young people).

Action Item 9

To invite the NCSA (and other relevant Departments) to a National CBNRM Forum meeting to explain the impact of relevant conventions on CBNRM, to CBNRM stakeholders.

The relevant project office at NCSA has agreed to make such a presentation during the planned CBNRM Conference in November.

Action Item 10

The CBNRM Support Programme to explore the need for a publication describing the conventions signed by the government of Botswana and the role that communities can play in the implementation of those.

The planned presentation at the CBNRM Conference makes it possible to include a section on the impact of (relevant) international conventions on CBNRM in the 2003 CBNRM Status Report and thus provide the necessary information to all stakeholders.

Action Item 11

KCS to circulate information on the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) to NGOs and other interested parties.

Done by email and a workshop on CBD was convened in conjunction with the NCSA.

Action Item 12

It was suggested that ways to improve Community-based Tourism (CBT) marketing beyond GoB support, possibly in co-operation with the private sector, be explored.

This item is not fully explored yet though an initial proposal in support of CBT marketing has been made to HATAB for discussion.

Action Item 13

CBNRM Support Programme to conduct a study on the impact of HIV/AIDS on CBNRM.

The Terms of Reference for the study were approved by the National CBNRM Forum steering committee in October 2002, funding has been secured and the consultant Leonard Dikobe has started. The report is expected in August 2003 and can be discussed during the upcoming CBNRM Conference.

Action Item 14

BOCOBONET to present a more quantified report for the next Forum on the implementation of National CBNRM Conference recommendation 1 (to organise exchange visits for CBOs with the aim to improve the understanding of CBNRM).

BOCOBONET to present a more quantified report.

BOCOBONET verbally presented a more quantified report and also explained that exposure visits are not meant for BOCOBONET board members only but for all CBOs in Botswana. The chairman requested BOCOBONET to prepare a written report also explaining the value or the lessons learnt during these exchange visits.

Action Item 15

The Secretariat to invite DWNP to respond to National CBNRM Conference recommendation 4 in writing in order to convey a clear and transparent message to the CBOs.

The Conference recommendation of November 2001 requested DWNP to give communities who lease a Controlled Hunting Area the management responsibility over birds and small game along the same lines as they manage the bigger wildlife species. In the past the Bird and the Small Game licences were open for anyone to apply. They could be used anywhere in Botswana

(including in the commercial and community concessions). This caused management conflicts and hence the above recommendation.

Since the renewed 2002 Hunting Regulations a clause has been added to the Bird and the Small Game Licences explaining that the licence is valid for the whole of Botswana except for National Parks and Game Reserves *and concession areas*. This means that while the communities have not been given the management responsibility over birds and small game, the potential management conflicts have disappeared.

Action Item 16

The Secretariat to present the report on the recommendations made during the November 2001 National CBNRM Conference as part of the CBNRM Status Report before the next National CBNRM conference.

This attempt will be made in the run-up of the planned National CBNRM Conference in November 2003.

Action Item 17

That National CBNRM Forum funding beyond 2003 should be explored by all forum members and discussed during the next Forum meeting 2003.

The National CBNRM Forum received funding for 2000 – 2003 from GEF. It was expected at that time to have a CBNRM policy, mentioning the need for “co-ordinating platforms”, in place before 2003. It was planned to request Government funding of the national Forum in the line with the policy. At present there is no policy, no further funding beyond 2003. Forum members are still requested to explore funding opportunities.

Presentation of the EU funded Wildlife Conservation and Management Programme (2002 – 2006) – the Community Development Fund (CDF) by Mr. K. Mpofu of DWNP/Darudec

The intended results of the programme are the following:

Result 1: Management of three PA's strengthened (CKGR, Moremi & Makgadikgadi)

Result 2: Stakeholder co-operation increased

Result 3: Benefits to communities increased

Result 4: Decisions better informed by research and monitoring

Result 5: DWNP strengthened

Under result area 3 the programme intends to increase benefits on NRM to communities amongst other things through a Community Development Fund of 6 million Pula over the programme period.

CBNRM in Botswana is characterised more by failures than successes. The challenge is to learn from the past and face reality and to have the courage to breakaway from past failed approaches. We should experiment wisely with fresh approaches. The reasons for failures: The concept of community managed enterprise projects is questionable; capacity building support (time and resources) is underestimated; programme scope and coverage have been over-ambitious and community “ownership” of projects is insufficient.

Furthermore, business advisory services have been inadequate. Thus support for project identification, formulation and implementation have been inadequate. Also Local Government structures (including TAC, District Councils & traditional authorities) were largely ignored/bypassed/sidelined.

The synergy between CDF & CCF was insufficient and the management structure for CDF was over-Centralized. The roles and task division among implementing partners (NGOs) lacked clarity.

The newly proposed strategy is to ensure viability of business-related projects by shifting emphasis away from approach that CBOs should become entrepreneurs towards an approach where CBOs create an environment that encourages entrepreneurs to invest with confidence by providing infrastructure, security of tenure and a regulatory framework.

The central focus of the programme will be achieved by ensuring that all entrepreneurial initiatives meaningfully benefit the community; relationships are contracted with clearly defined

responsibilities, monitoring and sanctioning mechanisms; CBOs retain full control and responsibility of funding provided by the CDF and thus CBOs are the intermediary with the programme.

The programme will provide assistance to emerging entrepreneurs in:

- Creating an awareness of business and funding opportunities;
- Identifying wildlife related business opportunities;
- Supporting the formulation of financing proposals;
- Transferring business skills; and
- Providing funds and providing ongoing follow-up support.

All communities in geographic scope will be made fully aware of the opportunity to apply for CDF funding. The procedures for making application for such funding; requesting support for drafting their proposals and selecting the support of a service provider (e.g. an NGO) as well as the criteria by which their proposals will be evaluated are going to be explained in a CDF tool kit to be prepared and disseminated by the programme shortly. More information on the Community Development Fund is provided in an annex to these minutes.

There were 3 questions from the floor:

1. It was suggested that as the emphasis of the CDF seems to be on tourism-related projects some of the money should be channelled through the Department of Tourism.
2. It was noted that it seems we are “doing away” with community entrepreneurship. Are we not dis-empowering communities?
3. It was remarked that the meeting was informed that CBOs are considered not very accountable and was therefore surprised to hear that CDF monies are going to be channelled through the same CBOs. Are there no alternatives?

The answers were as following:

1. It is true that the fund is managed by DWNP but projects are screened and advised upon at national and district level by a wider and multi-sectoral committee (of which DoT is part of).
2. (and 3) The CDF is not “doing away” with entrepreneurs nor does it give up on the CBOs as the most appropriate “users” of the fund. The emphasis shift that was mentioned is a result of learning that community organisations are not the best entities to manage enterprises. The communities can invest in and own enterprises but that does not mean they should manage them. That might be left to individuals or small interest groups that have the capability (and financial interest) to do so. The thinking is that CBOs should create the right conditions in their area for business to flourish. This can be done through planning, (co-)investment in infrastructure and development control. This means that the community is still in the driving seat deciding upon the type of development they want for their area. Furthermore we have learnt that before any type of business development can take place at community level some vital “building blocks” need to be in place. Examples are management plans, transparent financial management systems, marketing surveys and product development, contractual arrangements, facilitation services. The CDF can be used to put the necessary building blocks in place with the aim to generate viable and sustainable economic development at community level.

The chairman wonders why CBOs are pushed to reinvest income from the sale of quota into NRM-related development in their village. Why can't CBOs invest their capital in estate development in Gaborone for example and reap annual dividends?

The Community Based Strategy (CBS) by S.J. Baruti of the Rural Development Coordinating Division (RCD) in the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning

The main purpose of this presentation is to build and develop partnerships with the CBNRM Forum stakeholders in community development, through the Community Based Strategy (CBS).

The objectives are as follows:

- to publicise the Community Based Strategy.
- to re-iterate/ re-emphasise the need for bottom-up planning/ development approach.
- to understand your roles and learn from your experiences and views.

- to seek assistance on how to broaden participatory development philosophy.
- to consult the forum as stakeholders in participatory community development.

The RDCD was invited to this forum as a stakeholder in CBNRM. We decided that we should also contribute by presenting our side of community development work as espoused by the *Revised National Policy for Rural Development*, as implemented through the CBS. If we were asked to compare and contrast the CBNRM and CBS we would say that these are side of the same coin. Whereas CBNRM is about people participation in development projects, CBS is about the process of initiating the projects and carrying them through.

The Community Based Strategy (CBS)

In 1994, the Rural Development Council (RDC) appointed an inter-ministerial working group to design a community-based strategy for rural development. The realisation then was that the prospects for strengthening the rural economy and improving rural livelihoods depend upon giving communities more responsibility for their own development (CBS Report. 1997.v). hence community participation has become of paramount importance, and that all plans and developments programmes should have inbuilt participatory approaches. In this regard the following has been developed as key terminology in the Community Based Strategy:

- i). Community participation and participatory methodologies;
- ii). Community empowerment, espousing the gaining or transfer of power to control activities by the communities to improve their lives;
- iii). Community based programmes, that the programmes are selected, planned, and implemented by the people of a community through its leadership structures; and
- iv). Co-ordination - the harmonisation of the contributions of the various participants in development, including government, NGOs, communities, and individuals, in order to ensure the attainment of common development goals. These could be achieved in improving communication channels and effective decision making both by authorities and communities, and building complementary approaches.

Components of the CBS

The following are some of the components of the CBS:

- Social mobilisation and advocacy;
- Community participation;
- Community leadership;
- Transfer of planning, decision making responsibility, and control of resources to the communities;
- Development of Community Action Plans (CAPs), made up of community based projects developed through community organisations, training and institution building;
- Refocusing extension support to be community driven or directed; and
- Reorientation of co-ordination structures.

Assistance sought from Stakeholders

We would like to learn from you or have your input on the above approaches, and specifically on the following:

Community Mobilisation

- How did you manage to mobilise, interest, and keep communities on CBNRM?
- What has made this mobilisation successful?

Participatory Development Methodologies/planning techniques

- What participatory methodologies are you using and with how much success?

Co-ordinated planning and sustainable developments

- What co-ordination measures are in place for CBNRM projects?
- How do CBNRM projects link/relate to other development projects in the districts?
- How do the NGOs/Communities on CBNRM relate to the district extension structures?
- How can this be improved?

Monitoring of Community Participation and Community Empowerment

- How do these CBNRM project contribute/facilitate community empowerment? And most specifically,

- How do individual households benefit from the Trusts' work/ projects, etc?

An Annual Plan has been developed for the CBS sub-committee. The intention is to call a workshop soon for stakeholders where we hope these questions would be further clarified and developed into a more comprehensive action plan or guidelines. Among many issues that we think may need to be done/achieved at the workshop is to draft a programme of action for districts on the implementation of the CBS or to develop guidelines on how to move on with the CBS at district level. Sharing experiences with the CBNRM programme in Botswana will be very helpful in this process.

There were 2 questions from the floor:

1. A CBO wondered how the CBS can help the communities to get more support from Government to solve local development problems.
2. Are there resources under NDP9 to start implementing the CBS as resources will be required to promote the envisaged participatory development?

Answers:

1. What is envisaged under the CBS is that instead of Government extension officers telling people what to do it is the people organising themselves and agreeing on what they want and demanding from the extension officers as well as NGOs the kind of support they require. In other words CBS will make Government services more demand-driven and therefore more useful in solving local problems. Mr Baruti also emphasised the fact that generally government should source out more activities to NGOs so to allow for a better and faster coverage of the demands.
2. There is no shortage of financial resources in Government to address development issues in the country. There is lack of demand-driven planning, co-ordination, and streamlining of extension services. CBS intends to provide the environment that is more conducive for local development.

The chairman suggested to answer the questions raised in the presentation in a paper on CBNRM lessons learnt to be presented and discussed during the planned CBS stakeholder workshop. The National CBNRM Forum steering committee would be responsible for this.

Case study on Khwai by Frank Potts of Eco-Tourism Support Services from Maun

The study was commissioned by the CBNRM Support Programme with the aim to draw lessons from the Khwai experiences in regard of the recent financial management problems that resulted in DWNP not allocating the 2003 hunting quota. The full report on the case study can be found in an annex to these minutes.

The Khwai situation was presented as an example of a CBO where the financial management is not up to standard. Most CBOs in CBNRM are experiencing similar problems. What exactly went wrong in the case of Khwai?

- No financial/accounting procedures in place
- Lack of management and supervision
- Incomplete audit report suggesting fraud (this is a police case at present)
- Uncontrolled use of vehicles
- No business/annual work plan
- No comprehensive management plan

This situation was allowed to continue because:

- The board of the trust proved to be too powerful (wanted no intervention)
- Individual members who belonged to an elite abused their powers for self-gain
- No consultation let alone control by general membership
- Community members did not know how to voice their concerns
- Community members didn't dare to intervene for fear of reprisals

Government extension officers and NGOs did not intervene either.

In the end (after DWNP rightfully withheld the quota) the community called in DCEC that advised to call in the police. To avoid this from reoccurring it is advised to:

- Refine organisational/management structures (change the constitution)
- Demand for assistance from qualified accountants
- Engage external advisors
- Increase capacity building and training of community members
- Demand more comprehensive management plans

The lessons learnt imply the need for policy changes:

- Institute and effect more control mechanisms through the CBNRM policy and guidelines
- Ensure that communities are empowered but restrict the forming of small elites
- Provide examples of effective and transparent organisational structures

The presenter concluded by saying that Khwai community has recognised its mistakes and want to share their experiences with others in the hope of getting guidance on how to solve their problems. It was further suggested that the lessons of Khwai apply to the majority of CBOs (in fact all stakeholders, because we all failed) and that concerted efforts are now required to prevent this from happening again, anywhere in Botswana.

The way forward for Khwai Development Trust by Mr. K. Ntsogotho (Chairman of the current board of trustees of KDT)

The purpose of the presentation is to outline the way forward chosen by KDT and to solicit for comments and support. The current board with help of Eco-Tourism Support Services (ESS) have taken the following steps:

- A new board was democratically elected
- A literate treasurer is appointed
- Mismanagement was reported to DCEC and the police
- General membership as well as relevant authorities are consulted
- A leadership and governance course was given in Khwai
- Bank account signatories were changed
- Accountancy firm is engaged
- ESS contracted for facilitation services

The board intends to take more (reforming) steps:

- Comprehensive review of KDT operations
- SWOT analysis of the organisation
- Planned workshop to identify ways of improvement and develop annual work plan
- Identify training needs and opportunities
- Develop a Community Investment Plan

Comments, questions and answers

A representative from Kgetsi-ya-Tsie mentioned that Government extension services do not respond in time. If individual community members or staff hired by the CBO create problems there is usually nobody from Government to help.

A representative from Sankuyo complained that the current joint venture partner refuses to pay the next instalment. The problem with the company needs to be addressed by DWNP and the CBO asks for support.

DWNP: On the alleged lack of intervention in Khwai it is noted that DWNP warned the community 2 consecutive years to prepare an audit or lose the quota. The CBO did not react. DWNP adds that withholding the quota is not a permanent measure but an encouragement to improve the management performance. The Director upon receiving a Ngamiland TAC report will consider issuing the quota for the remainder of 2003. DWNP wonders why Government is sometimes accused of imposing too much control and sometimes of not intervening.

BWMA explained that the 2001 Khwai auction revenues were low because of the imposed ban on lion hunting. The association defends the auction system by saying that it allows the community more freedom to plan for their own development. The private sector does not have to build any

infrastructure (but rents it from the CBO) and there is no need for expensive Technical Proposal writing. The latter should be done away with in any case because these proposals do not give room to the community to define the way they want to use their natural resources. The CBO should be in a position to determine their development (management plan/Joint Venture proposals), the private sector just pays for whatever is for sale (and in demand).

It was suggested by the floor that as long as there are no proper administration structures in place CBOs should just pay out monetary dividends to households in stead of allowing boards to manage or reinvest huge sums of money (in which they have no skills whatsoever). An exception would be a brilliant idea on a viable investment and the availability of expertise to manage (or sub-contract).

It was questioned who pays the 4% auction costs? Does Khwai has to refund these costs to the auctioneer or to the disappointed buyers? Furthermore, many people were employed by the trust. What happened to them? Are they still on the payroll (without any present trust income to pay them from)?

What has been the role of BOCOBONET? What have they been doing to resolve the problems at Khwai?

On the last question the BOCOBONET project officer admitted that BOCOBONET has not intervened timely and effectively due to limited resources. Also financial management is an expertise that requires hiring in of experts. Organisations like BOCOBONET do not have that expertise.

It was further commented that the “situation” in Khwai is not an exception. The problem is that people in Botswana are not prosecuted when they commit fraud. Laws and government are too relaxed. The result is that people generally feel no guilt when “stealing” from their organisation. Audit reports do not help much to reveal fraud either. Auditing is largely a paper exercise (conducted from Gaborone) without real research. These exercises fail to address management and governance problems. In case of mismanagement of funds by individuals sanctions should be imposed on the entire board thus making all the board members accountable and hopefully encouraging them to avoid individuals taking advantage.

GEF continued iterating that management plans should be in place and followed to give controlled guidance to the operation of the CBO. GEF further agreed with BWMA that quota auctions are appropriate.

Poor financial management in CBNRM at community level and exploring options on how to address the problems by Mr. Nico Rozemeijer of the CBNRM Support Programme

The previous presentation made clear that (in some instances) community resources are controlled by the Boards of trusts in a non-transparent and non-accountable manner. In summary the problem is threefold:

1. There is (in some cases) a lack of skills at community level to set up and maintain financial management systems that allow for full accountability (to Government as well as to the general trust membership);
2. In general there are insufficient control mechanisms to avoid a small and “better-skilled” section of the community to take advantage of the power vacuum and to monopolise the community benefits;
3. The general membership of most trusts is not empowered enough to demand accountability and representative decision-making from their leadership.

Concerted efforts need to be made to address the threefold problem simultaneously:

1. Refinement of appropriate CBO financial management systems and ongoing training of community leadership and staff on how to apply them;

2. To introduce “checks and balances” in the CBNRM Policy and related implementation guidelines to ensure an appropriate measure of control over the CBO financial management practice; and
3. To intensify and improve the facilitation of CBNRM implementation at community level by Government extension services and NGOs.

The most obvious solution to “lack of skills” is to train community members in financial management. This would enable the relevant Board members (or hired community staff) to maintain the records in an “acceptable” manner and to ensure that every year a financial audit can be done in time. However, training of individuals does not solve the second and third part of the problem identified. Every financial management system needs to have built in a set of control mechanisms to ensure accountability.

Control should ideally not be imposed by external agents. Appropriate mechanisms should be designed by the community themselves to enable them to hold their leadership accountable for decisions made in their name. However, demanding accountability assumes an informed and empowered community membership. This is a condition not often found in rural Botswana. To help community membership to understand their roles and responsibilities and to assist them in holding their leadership accountable NGO and Government extension services need to be stepped up.

The presenter wanted to concentrate on the possible introduction of “checks and balances”. A number of control mechanisms are proposed in his paper (see also the 4th annex to these proceedings). The presenter hopes to generate discussion on how to solve the financial management problems that CBOs face today in CBNRM.

At present there is only one financial control mechanism: the annual audit of accounts. We now know the repercussion of having the books not passing the test of the auditors: it means running the risk of not getting the quota.

Why is an annual financial audit not enough?

Financial audits tend to focus on how the accounts are kept and not so much on what the CBO revenues were spent on. Following bookkeeping rules and presenting balanced accounts is important but this does not guarantee full accountability. Those who are chosen to represent the community (in the Board) are also accountable towards the general membership in regard of following the CBO constitution (and the relevant Government policies). These policies (and most constitutions) clearly outline a number of principles that give direction to the trust and its board. The (draft) CBNRM Policy mentions for example that:

- “Regular benefit distribution effects must be felt at household level”;
- “The need of subsistence users must be supported”

The community representatives have to explain how they incorporated these principles in their plans and activities for the benefit of the entire community. A financial audit is not the right instrument to bring about this clarity.

Possible control mechanism 2:

Before the end of a calendar year a “Community Investment Plan” (CIP) for the coming year has to be prepared and approved by the general membership of the community. It details how the anticipated revenue will be spent. The CIP is made to ensure that the entire community decides “on what to spend the money on”. The CIP is presented to DWNP as part of the quota request and to the Land Authority as part of the request to sub-lease. Both authorities will see to it that the CIP is in line with the CBNRM Policy (and possible implementation guidelines).

The CIP is further presented to the relevant District Council for information to encourage co-ordination of the development process.

Pertinent sections of the (draft) CBNRM Policy that need to be addressed in the CIP are:

- “The connection between benefits and sound conservation practices must be strong and must be based on sound business principles”;
- “Regular benefit distribution effects must be felt at household level”;
- “The need of subsistence users must be supported”

- “Not more than 25% of the total value of annual benefits can be used for administrative purposes”

The Policy gives guidance in preparing the CIP and by doing so this will satisfy Government that CBNRM revenues benefit the entire community.

It is possible to introduce a third control mechanism:

With a CIP in place the planned expenditure is more or less defined. How to ensure that the planned budget is adhered to? To that effect an independent authority could come in as “second (or a third) signature” to “authorise the expenditure”. This independent authority could be a registered accountant or for example the District Council internal auditor.

How does that work in practice? Joint venture income is deposited in a separate interest bearing account. A maximum of 25% will be transferred to the trust administrative account (cheque signed by chairman and/or treasurer and independent authority). Further investment or benefit distribution payments can be made in concurrence with the CIP along similar lines.

A fourth possible control mechanism:

Financial administration requires a fair amount of discipline. To encourage this, the trust should prepare quarterly financial reports (also to justify budget adjustments), approved by the general membership and presented to the Land Authority and DWNP. Reports should include a narrative part referring to the CIP and up to standard financial statement. Towards the end of the year the reports culminate in an annual (financial) report to account for the expenditure made.

Concluding remarks

The communities involved in CBNRM face problems of which Khwai is an example. In order to avoid unilateral Government decisions that could seriously affect the core principles of CBNRM, the stakeholders have to be more pro-active and rethink the way CBNRM was designed in Botswana, to address fundamental flaws, to adapt and to improve. To start with, structural adjustments have to be made in the financial management of CBNRM projects at community level as it affects the heart of community natural resource management: *people will conserve natural resources if they benefit*. What if they do not?

The National CBNRM Forum is the ideal platform to start this debate, to invite the communities themselves to present solutions and to make concerted efforts to improve CBNRM policy and implementation in Botswana.

Discussion

It has been proposed to introduce more financial control mechanisms in the (draft) CBNRM Policy and implementation guidelines and by doing so to encourage CBOs to amend their constitutions. These proposed mechanisms include (apart from an annual audit):

- Obligatory preparation of a Community Investment Plan;
- An external second (or third) signature to authorise budgeted CBO expenditure;
- Regular financial reports to DWNP and the Land Authority.

Questions to the participants:

1. Is it agreed that there are financial management problems at CBO level and that corrective measures are necessary?
2. Discuss the three additional control mechanisms that are proposed. Are they practical and sufficient to address the present financial management problems at CBO level?
3. Are there alternative ways of improving the financial management systems at CBO level?

In response to the presentation the participants raised some questions: Are the modalities and systems set-up for the management of CBNRM projects/activities correct? Are the communities responding? Would stronger linkages between community organisations e.g. Trusts, VDCs and other village committees assist in improving the management of community projects and membership participation?

Generally the Forum agreed that financial control mechanisms need to be explored and introduced to improve financial management at community level.

The Deeds of Trusts don't define what exactly should happen with the money earned at the end of the year and, in most of the deeds, there is no clear definition of how the benefits will be distributed. This leads easily to mismanagement. It is important that rules on the distribution of benefits from CBNRM be clearly defined. Furthermore constitutions of CBOs don't say much on membership, CBNRM stakeholders should be guiding the communities in the review of their constitutions and incorporating control mechanisms. The present National CBNRM Review should address these issues as well when conducting the case studies.

Regular reports to the Kgotla could also be introduced and community members should be more involved and informed about the trust status and activities.

Regarding the current way of annual reporting members thought that these are not useful. In addition it seems that what is considered a "small" unaccounted amount of money at the end of the year (e.g. 100.000P for 1 Trust) is not taken seriously. If this is done for 10 Trusts the "small" unaccounted amount of money becomes very important (1 million P). Financial reports are currently only used as a tool to receive the quota but they do not guarantee appropriate management of funds. It was suggested that if reports were made on a more regular basis (monthly/quarterly) it could help in identifying unaccounted expenditures sooner and in solving the issues before the end of the year. Monthly financial reports could improve accountability but may require the hiring of qualified accountants.

Regarding the second possible control mechanism (Community Investment Plan (CIP)) some members noted that it should not necessarily have to be attached to the quota especially as DWNP might not have the capacity to evaluate these CIP. They are not experts in finances. They manage natural resources!

Regarding the second (third) external signature some felt that this option wouldn't be an appropriate mechanism, as it doesn't guarantee avoiding the mismanagement of funds. Past experiences have shown that even external auditors and accountants can misuse funds. In addition it was felt that an obligatory external signature would make it very difficult for remote villages (far away from the accountant in town) to manage their funds. It could be more effective to make trust signatories personally responsible and hold them liable for losses due to mismanagement.

Some questions were raised on the need of a CBNRM policy and whether it would "oblige" trusts to follow the guidelines and rules or whether a better option would be to give CBOs less power and solve these problems first? In reply it was mentioned that CBOs do not have the legal obligation to follow a CBNRM Policy but if the CBOs want the hunting quota DWNP will insist that they follow the policy and the guidelines that are part of it!

Finally the issue of formal education rather than short courses on financial management was mentioned as a necessary process for CBOs to improve their skills. Some of the presented mechanisms might work but more time to go through these mechanisms with the communities themselves should be given. DWNP is spearheading CBNRM but the communities are not able to follow. To inform communities about certain issues or possible control mechanisms is not enough for them to understand! Community members need to be formally educated in general and only this will lead to structural improvement.

Closing remarks from the chairman (at 17.45 hrs.)

The chairman thanked all participants for actively taking part in the discussion and helping to chart a way forward. He reiterated that the stakeholders have to think of effective solutions to the financial management problems at community level, also to show Government that the identified problems are taken serious by everybody and responded to. He suggested convening a National CBNRM Forum steering committee meeting as soon as possible to agree upon a strategy with options for solutions.

Action items of the National CBNRM Forum

The recommendations made in the November 2001 National CBNRM Conference have been translated into action items and are followed-up by the steering committee of the National CBNRM Forum and regularly reported upon. The following list of action items is still pending:

Action Item 1

BOCOBONET and BOCONGO should meet to finalise the proposed "Partnership Guidelines".

Action Item 2

The National CBNRM Forum steering committee should prepare a paper addressing the questions put forward in the CBS presentation and present them to the upcoming CBS stakeholder workshop.

Action Item 3

To invite the NCSA (and other relevant Departments) to a National CBNRM Forum meeting to explain the impact of relevant conventions on CBNRM, to CBNRM stakeholders and to have the information published.

Action Item 4

It was suggested that ways to improve Community-based Tourism (CBT) marketing beyond GoB support, possibly in co-operation with the private sector, be explored.

Action Item 5

CBNRM Support Programme to conduct a study on the impact of HIV/AIDS on CBNRM.

Action Item 6

BOCOBONET to present a more quantified lessons-learnt report for the next Forum on the implementation of National CBNRM Conference recommendation 1 (to organise exchange visits for CBOs with the aim to improve the understanding of CBNRM).

Action Item 7

The Secretariat to provide regular feedback on the National CBNRM Review to all stakeholders.

Action Item 8

The Secretariat to present the report on the recommendations made during the November 2001 National CBNRM Conference as part of the CBNRM Status Report before the next National CBNRM conference.

Action Item 9

That National CBNRM Forum funding beyond 2003 should be explored by all forum members.

Action Item 10

The National CBNRM Forum steering committee should convene as soon as possible and prepare a paper on the options to solve the financial management problems at community level.