

*1<sup>st</sup> draft prepared by Chimed, 21<sup>st</sup> of December 2007*

## **TRIP REPORT ON WWF EXCHANGE PROGRAMME BETWEEN MONGOLIA AND NAMIBIA ON COMMUNITY BASED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

### **BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION**

Mongolia, a landlocked country located in the heart of Central Asia, lies between the Russian Federation to the north and the People's Republic of China to the east, west and south. With a total of 1.5 Million square km, Mongolia is half the size of India, making it the fifth largest country in Asia and seventeenth in the world. In contrast to its huge territory, Mongolia is sparsely populated (about 2.5 Million inhabitants).

Mongolia entered the 1990's with its natural environment largely intact and it has a great diversity of natural resources, including wildlife, many of which have been only slightly exploited. But natural resources and biodiversity are declining fast and trend is common country wide. Especially, wildlife species declined dramatically in last 15 years due to number of reasons such as poverty, increased market demand/access from/to China and lack of law enforcement.

In vast and remote areas of Mongolia, local communities are the most effective guardians of natural resources and conservation values, where law enforcement capacities of local governments and of protected areas' administrations are limited due to lack of technical expertise and funding. The government of Mongolia with support from international communities recognizes these obstacles and needs for biodiversity conservation and therefore, a policy framework for Community Based Natural Resource Management has been established in 2005 through the amendments of law "Law on Nature Conservation". However, there are significant needs to strengthen the legal environment in support of resource stewardship by local communities, to strengthen the capacities of community based organizations, and to enhance cooperation between government and community organizations in the natural resource management.

Namibia is also large land locked country in Africa located between South Africa, Angola and Botswana. With a population of about 1.8 Million, Namibia is one of the most sparsely populated countries in the world, too. To be exact, Namibia is neighboring with Mongolia in the lower part of the list of population densities by countries. Additionally, Namibia is species rich country with high endemism for both fauna and flora. It is also home of free-roaming populations of Africa's big five (L.Chris Weaver and Theunis Petersen, 2007). Namibia developed and applied successfully the Community Based Natural Resource Management approach to the state owned land based on wildlife and tourism since 1996 when communal area conservancy legislation passed.



WWF is working in both countries to support the implementation of CBNRM. WWF Mongolia started applying CBNRM approach since 2005 in pasture management issues for the Khar Us Nuur National Park and extending now to apply this approach into the areas outside of Protected Area for sustainable hunting and wildlife management. WWF is successfully implementing the LIFE project (Living in a Finite Environment) in Namibia since 1993 and has accumulated substantial experiences over the years.

The activities of “Nokhorlol” - communities for natural resource management in Mongolia are limited only to pasture and forest management and their developments are at the beginning stage, while communal conservancies in Namibia are very much experienced since 1996 on wildlife management and tourism and expand their management activities beyond the wildlife to other natural resources. There are lot of similarities in both countries in terms of location, size of country, population density, development path and approaches applying for natural resource management.

## **THE OBJECTIVES OF THE EXCHANGE PROGRAMME**

Therefore, the overall objective of the exchange programme is to exchange lessons learned between two WWF offices in Namibia and Mongolia on CBNRM with special focus on wildlife management, which will help to increase conservation impacts of WWF’s new initiative for wildlife management in Mongolia supported by WWF-NL through interventions at policy and field levels.

The exchange programme focused on following topics:

### **A. Policy legislation**

- Mechanism of Quota
- Certification of hunting companies
- Policy framework of National CBNRM Program
- Benefit sharing and community empowerment

### **B. Technical**

- Enterprise management systems to conservancies and community-based tourism and marketing
- Recovery of Wildlife Populations - Community recognition of wildlife as a valuable resource (i.e., land-use planning, game introductions, reduced poaching, etc.) that are contributing to widespread recovery of wildlife populations.

### **C. Institutional**

- Mobilization and organization of pilot conservancies



- Structure and management of Namibia Association of CBNRM Support Organizations
- Strengthened National Support Systems - At the commencement of the LIFE Project, there were two NGOs and one MET directorate involved in CBNRM activities.

#### D. Monitoring

- Method of game species population monitoring in field
- Benefit from CBNRM to local individual households

#### E. Planning

- Participatory planning of CBNRM
- Business planning

The trip programme, developed by LIFE project staff is attached hereto.

### **THE PARTICIPANTS:**

#### **From Stakeholders:**

- Mr. D.Batsaikhan, Local Parliament Speaker, Uvs Province
- Mr. B.Otgoo, Conservation officer, Local Governor's Office, Uvs province
- B.Ganbold, Head of Anti-poaching Unit, Uvs province
- B.Galbadrakh, Director of Mon Tur Company, specialized on trophy hunting

#### **From WWF Mongolia Programme Office:**

- D.Baigalmaa, Rural and community development officer in WWF Mongolia's Altai-Sayan field office
- Yo. Onon, Species officer in WWF Mongolia PO head office in Ulaanbaatar
- B.Chimed-Ochir, Director of WWF Mongolia PO
- O.Jennersten, Chair of WWF Mongolia PO and WWF-SE

### **TRIP ITINERY:**

The trip started ran from 26<sup>th</sup> of November – 03<sup>rd</sup> of December, 2007. The following meetings were held:

Organization	Subject covered	Representative
Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organisations (NASCO)	Introduction to NACSO, CBNRM and Conservancy overview and challenges to the national CBNRM programme	Maxi Pia Louis, Coordinator NACSO Secretariat
WWF LIFE Programme in Namibia	Community based wildlife utilization their impacts on local people and wildlife	Chris Weaver, Programme leader

Organization	Subject covered	Representative
	population, hunting concession, tender and contracts, best praxis and challenges facing community wildlife utilization	
White Lady Lodge	Relationship between lodge and conservancy, how does conservancy benefits from lodge, marketing, tourism and hunting conflict, challenges and transparency issues	Lodge manager, one of investors
Daureb Tour Guides of National Heritage Site “White Lady” rock painting in Brandberg	Role and responsibilities of guides, benefits to be a conservancy members, relationship National Heritage Council and conservancy and further MET	
Tsiseb Conservancy	Organizational structure of conservancy, income sources and benefit sharing, setting quotes for hunting and organizing hunting, sharing benefit among members, opportunities, challenges and mistakes	
Wilderness Safari Doro Nawas lodge	JV agreement between lodge and conservancy, role and responsibility of joint management committee, marketing issue, benefits to community from lodge, challenges and opportunities, ownership of capital asset issues	Camp manager
Torra Conservancy and IRDNC	Organizational structure of conservancy, income sources and benefit sharing, setting quotes for hunting and organizing hunting, sharing benefit among members, opportunities, challenges and mistakes,	Coordinator of conservancy and local coordinator of IRDNC

Organization	Subject covered	Representative
	role and responsibilities of IRDNC for institutional development of conservancy, challenges facing to communities	
Grootenberg Mountain Lodge	Management agreement between management team and conservancy, marketing issue	Management team
Khoadi Hoas conservancy	Introduction of conservancy, community institutional structure, income sources and benefit sharing system, wildlife survey and setting quote, event book system, human and wildlife conflict and taken measures, role and responsibilities of board member, cooperation between farmer union and conservancy,	Coordinator and communication officer of conservancy, board member conservancy and member of farmer union

### **COMPRISION BETWEEN NAMIBIAN COMMUNITY CONSERVANCIES AND MONGOLIAN NATURE CONSERVATION PARTNER/FRIENDSHIP GROUP, SO CALLED “NOKHORLOL”**

Both countries have been applied CBNRM approaches in order to improve management of renewable natural resources e.g. wildlife, forest, forest by-products etc. If we look closer in to the legislative frame work, implementation mechanisms and implementation process in the field, there are many differences. Major differences are in legislative framework, government structure and governance issues. In Namibia, the government delegated its mandate for natural resource management and revenues from natural resource usage fully to conservancies, while in Mongolia, the government shifted only its conservation obligation to the community but without funding. Community members have user right of certain natural resources in their territory only for household and the government is playing pre-dominant role in permission system. In following table, we tried to summarize major differences between Mongolia and Namibia.

	<b>Namibian “Conservancy”</b>	<b>Mongolian “Nokhorlol”</b>
Definition	A conservancy is a group of farms and/or area of communal land on which neighboring landowners/members have pooled	A group of people formed voluntarily basis in order to conserve and sustainable use certain natural resources (forest,

	<b>Namibian “Conservancy”</b>	<b>Mongolian “Nokhorlol”</b>
	their resources for the purpose of conserving and utilizing wildlife on their combined properties and/or area of communal land	wildlife, plants etc except mineral resources, pasture, water body and areas for especial purpose) on contractual basis within their administrative territory/units (Mongolia divided administratively 21 aimags/provinces and 332 soums/districts)
Size of Area	No limits, up to several hundreds thousands	Up to 6,000 ha in forested area, and up to 10,000 ha in arid area (desert steppe and steppe)
Registration process	Registered by MET for unlimited time frame and for registration needs: Agreed boundary of area, list of adult memberships, conservancy committee, constitution, plan for equitable distribution funds	Registered by district governor for 5 years, which can be extended by 5 years step. For registration needs: Cooperation agreement signed by all members, constitution, conservation programme, local parliament decision, request for registration signed by all members
Number of members	Several hundreds to several thousands, 61 – 25,000 members (over the age 18)	In forested area more than 30 and dry areas more than 20, no upper limit (over the age 18)
Institutional structure	Highest decision making body is annual membership meeting. The management structure consists from conservancy committee and executive body elected or appointed by committee. Executive body can hire employers e.g. game guards, communication officer etc according to needs	Highest decision making body is membership meeting. From the meeting will be elected board, control board and leadership of the “nokhorlol” The nokhorlol will have common fund and management of common fund will set by constitution.
Management and utilization rights of natural resource e.g. wildlife	Setting hunting quote and kind of hunting (trophy, shut and sell etc) jointly with MET and revenue can be used for the benefits of residents (finance projects for common benefits and distribute among household), conservancy can enter directly agreements with the private sector e.g. professional hunters and private investors for tourist lodge	No really management rights, mostly conservation obligations, only household use according to permission given by district governor, limits set by government institution, user fees paid to government, can not enter directly agreement with private sector for usage of natural resource e.g. wildlife
Opportunities and	Namibia is very good on track to protect nature and at same time	CBNRM concept in Mongolia is still in embryo development stage

	Namibian “Conservancy”	Mongolian “Nokhorlol”
challenges	diversify people’s livelihood and alleviate poverty in rural area, if conservancy members to manage strengthening their institutional structure and increasing different management skills.	and needs to improve legislative framework in order to go in right direction. Mongolia have great advantages in CBNRM e.g.: High literacy rate Increased public concern on biodiversity loss and environmental degradation due to close connection to nature, especially rural people Existence of some policy framework for introducing CBNRM in rural area

### LESSIONS LEARNT

Even though there are some substantial differences between Namibia and Mongolia in legislative framework, governance, geographical condition, culture and mentality, we learned a lot. The exchange trip was inspiring for capturing ideas, which can be transferred into Mongolia’s condition. There are:

- The CBNRM policy of Namibia shifted the mandate of natural resource to the conservancies and minimized government interventions and involvements at necessary level.
- NASCO is a good structure, which coordinates and streamlines donor and different NGO activities in CBNRM. It seems to us that NASCO is not only supporting structure for conservancies but it is also a learning platform where the organizations can share the experiences in the field of CBNRM.
- The area of conservancy is large enough in order to manage effectively wildlife population, especially migratory and large animals, which needs big area for survival
- Certification of hunting company is under consideration but in case, conservancy can enter directly into agreement with hunting company might not necessary, if the transparency by development process of agreement secured. Because in the country is easy to know who is who.
- Quote setting is bottom up and participatory based joint annual survey in June. Only, how to consider the population structure and mortalities of the species by the setting the quote is questionable.



- Contract agreement for hunting and tourism facilities is good system, which can be also introduced in Mongolia. Tender for business opportunities and ownership rights of immovable assets such as lodge etc was difficult to understand for some trip members
- Proper land use planning and zonation schema is important especially where hunting and tourism development have conflicts. Event book system is easy tool for monitoring of wildlife, which can be introduced also in Mongolia, especially Saiga and CBWM projects.

## **CONCLUSION AND AKNOWLEDGEMENT**

Again, the exchange trip was inspiring to getting ideas, which can be translated into Mongolia's condition. Many thanks to Namibia team for preparing and putting such interested itinerary together. Special thanks to Andee for his time traveling with us and guiding us through country and as well as through difficult topics. His knowledge on topics and country was very valuable for us.

Last but not least, many thanks to Frans Schepers from WWF -NL for his first suggestion in June 2007 during Mongolia Country Team meeting, his facilitation between Namibia and Mongolia on the exchange trip and further financial promotion that the trip real happened.