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The CBNRM is implemented in Africa for the purpose of natural resources (NR) conservation by all stakeholders. It was first introduced in Botswana in 1990 through the partnership of USAID and Botswana government with a view to funding NRM projects (Ngwira et al., 2013; Mbaiwa, 2011).

Introduced in the Okavango Delta (OD) in 1995 to organize and mobilize rural communities’ participation in NR conservation and environmental sustainability.

The thrust is poverty reduction through rural employment and income generation.

The CBNRM framework addresses the unsustainable local practices that lead to the NRs depletion (USAID, 2009).

If given full ownership, community people will sustainably manage natural resources (Twyman, 2000).

CBOs are registered Trusts meant to implement CBNRM programs (Mbaiwa, 2011) through eco-tourism.

CBNRM is thus a major driver of eco-tourism activities in the delta.
The Problem

- Research in biodiversity has shown that the majority of world’s biodiversity is found in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA)
- Biodiversity decline is prevalent in developing countries like Botswana, Zambia, Kenya, Peru and Nepal (Mbaiwa and Kolawole, 2013)
- Nonetheless, the decline in wildlife population is a critical challenge facing Botswana
- CBNRM is solely implemented in the delta because of the abundant wildlife populations and NRs in the area
- CBNRM in certain places in the area has had positive impacts on rural livelihoods, NRs utilization and wildlife management practices (Ngwira et al., 2013)
- However, there are many cases of poor implementation of CBNRM policy and ineffective performance of community trusts (CTs) (Mbaiwa, 2011)
- While some of the problems have been documented, factors which directly influence the effective or ineffective performance of CTs are yet to be documented
Research questions

- What are the characteristics of the committee/BoT and community members of CTs, which influence the implementation of RD/CBNRM projects?
- Which existing CBNRM projects are implemented by the CTs?
- What are the institutional factors affecting the performance of CTs in CBNRM project implementation?
- Are there differences existing between the effective CTs and ineffective ones in relation to RD project implementation?
• Sustainable tourism model (Mbaiwa and Stronza, 2009), which elucidates on economic efficiency (Paehlkke, 1999), social equity (Ehrenhalt, 1995) and environmental sustainability (WTO, 2004), guided the research.
The Okavango Delta (OD) receives its water from the upland plains of northern Angola.

The population comprises people of diverse ethnic groups such as the BaSarwa, BaYei, BaSubiya, BaTawana, etc. (CSO, 2011).

Most people engage in farming, animal husbandry, fishing, hunting and fruit gathering.

Four communities purposively selected – Mababe, Sankoyo, Shorobe and Matlapana.
Inclusion and exclusion criteria used for selecting ‘effective’ or ‘ineffective’ CTs, based on their functionality/non-functionality and employment generating activities

- Two effective CTs selected include Sankoyo Tshwaragano Management Trust (STMT); and Mababe Zokotshama Development Trust (MZDT)
- Two ineffective CTs selected are Matlalapana Community Trust (MCT); and Shorobe Community Trust (SCT)

Thirty (30) community people (both women and men) were randomly sampled from each of Mababe, Sankoyo, Shorobe and Matlapana villages (120 in total)

Nine (9) committee members were selected from the 2 effective CTs; and 9 from the 2 ineffective CTs (18 in total)

Questionnaires, interview schedules, FGD and key informant interviews were used to collect information
Data analysis

- Data were summarized using frequency, percentages, measures of central tendency and charts
- Inferential statistics used were T-test and Chi square analysis
Findings - Demographics

Education level of executive Committee Members

Education level of ordinary/community members

Education level of executive committee members of both effective and ineffective CTs

Education level of community or ordinary members of effective and ineffective CTs
Household size of executive committee members

Household size of community members

Demographics cont’d
Cultural mix

Ethnicity of committee members

Ethnicity of community members

Ethnic background of executive committee members of both effective and ineffective CTs

Ethnic background of community or ordinary members of both effective and ineffective CTs
Characteristics of CTs

**Meeting frequency**

- **Effective CTs**
  - Very regularly: 70.00%
  - Regularly: 30.00%
  - Not regularly: 0.00%

- **Ineffective CTs**
  - Very regularly: 0.00%
  - Regularly: 10.00%
  - Not regularly: 90.00%

**Frequency of meetings of executive committee members of both effective and ineffective CTs**

**Reporting of progress**

- **Effective CTs**
  - Monthly: 0.00%
  - Every three months: 10.00%
  - Every six months: 20.00%
  - Annually: 50.00%
  - Never reports: 20.00%
  - Not applicable: 10.00%

- **Ineffective CTs**
  - Monthly: 0.00%
  - Every three months: 10.00%
  - Every six months: 20.00%
  - Annually: 50.00%
  - Never reports: 20.00%
  - Not applicable: 10.00%

Opinions of community members on the frequency at which progress of projects are reported by committee members of both effective and ineffective CTs.
Institutional Roles

Role of the government

Role of international bodies

Role of the government of Botswana in facilitating CBNRM project implementation

Role of international organizations in the implementation of CBNRM projects
Training frequency of executive members of CTs

Percentage

Fairly regular training
Regular training
No training

Effective CTS
Ineffective CTs

Frequency of training received by executive committee members of both effective and ineffective CTs
Projects implemented by effective CTs

- House construction – Lodges and accommodations
- Water tap installations
- Yard fencing
- Campsites
- Production of benches
- Procurement of litter bins
- Building of toilets
- Business grants
- Scholarship awards
- Welfare programme (care for orphans and old people)
- Other projects
Mababe Zokotsama Development Trust (MZDT) Office Building
Sankuyo Tshwaragano Management Trust (STMT) Office Building
Common and recurrent challenges in project implementation

- Lack of funds
- Hunting ban
- Lack of technical skills
- Internal attritions/conflict situations
- Embezzlement of funds
- Poor management
- One man in Shorobe community said:

  ‘...Community Trusts’ membership should be based on qualifications and management skills should be the first priority...The main factor that contributed to our Trust’s failure is the lack of management skills by the people running it...’

- An old man in Shorobe community also vented his anger thus:

  ‘...We do not know why people have the impression that we still have a Trust in this village! Our leaders have let foreigners play on our minds; they have exploited the resources which the Trusts should have managed and from which it would have benefitted. We don’t even have a single project that we can confidently boast of as being successful besides the two children who got scholarships...’
### Differences between the attributes of successful CTs and their committee members, and those of the CTs which failed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Length of stay in community by committee member</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Age of committee members</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Level of education of committee member</td>
<td>3.921</td>
<td>1.473</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Meeting frequency</td>
<td>-0.556</td>
<td>-2.132*</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Committee members’ participation in meetings</td>
<td>-1.222</td>
<td>-3.143**</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Frequency of trainings on projects implementation for TC members</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Number of males in CT</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. Number of youth in CT</td>
<td>-1.333</td>
<td>-2.530*</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. CT membership strength (Number)</td>
<td>-3.111</td>
<td>-28.000**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. Number of CBNRM projects implemented by the CT</td>
<td>5.444</td>
<td>7.897**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field survey, 2014  
*T-value is significant at p ≤ 0.05  
**T-value is significant at p ≤ 0.01
## Differences in the attributes of community members who successfully implemented CBNRM projects and those who did not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Length of stay in the community by community members</td>
<td>5.683</td>
<td>1.472</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Age of community members</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Level of education of community members</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Employment status of community members</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.168</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Household size of community members</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>-0.423</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Number of CBNRM projects implemented by the CT in the village</td>
<td>3.050</td>
<td>18.070*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2014
*T-value is significant at p ≤ 0.000
Chi-square results showing the associations between the attributes of committee members of CTs and CBNRM project implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$X^2$-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Gender</td>
<td>5.73*</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Marital status</td>
<td>12.08**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Membership participation in meetings</td>
<td>11.05*</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field survey, 2014

* $X^2$-value significant at $P \leq 0.10$

** $X^2$-value significant $P \leq 0.05$
Chi-square results showing the associations between community members’ attributes and CBNRM project implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$X^2$-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Length of stay in the community (years of residence)</td>
<td>399.76**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Gender</td>
<td>28.68**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Income</td>
<td>250.56*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Ethnicity</td>
<td>69.88**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Reporting of the progress of projects by CT Board members</td>
<td>130.42**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field survey, 2014
* $X^2$-value significant at $P \leq 0.10$
** $X^2$-value significant $P \leq 0.05$
Conclusions

• Findings revealed that a number of CBNRM projects were successfully implemented by the effective CTs
• BoT/Committee members may have been more impactful in project implementation
• Conversely, there were no tangible projects implemented by the ineffective CTs
• The reasons for the variance in the number of projects implemented were diverse!
• **Success factors include:** meeting frequency and training; members’ effective participation in meetings; membership structure (number of youth membership); membership strength, progress reporting; etc.
• **Failure factors include:** poor management skills; ineffective social-cultural linkage; members’ lack of commitment and complacency; lack of entrepreneurial skills; etc.
Policy issues

• Adequate trainings of Trusts’ members; diversification of investments; effective networking and benchmarking amongst CTs and other external bodies are necessary for successful implementation of CBNRM projects

• Others issues for consideration are government minimal or non-interference in CTs’ activities; and

• Upholding objective recruitment criteria devoid of cronyism in the appointment of committee members
Appreciation!
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