

## Project stakeholder analysis

### SWOT of Key Project Stakeholders

Stakeholder group	Strengths	Weakness	Opportunities	Threats
<b>Project partners</b>				
<b>MET</b>	Political will to the project and committed to CBNRM	Poor capacity, in particular in the lower implementation ranks	New Wildlife and National Parks Bill	Lack of funding, very tight budget. For example, despite HWC being a political issue no treasury funds allocated for HWCSRS
<b>National Parks</b>	Many are economic hubs through the concession policy allowing for concession being granted to neighbouring communities	Poorly managed		
<b>CCFN</b>	Independent, strong board, political support	Untested, still in the process of establishment, i.e. operations manuals, hiring of CEO	Provides for long term sustainable financing mechanism for MSP, HWC and PES	Funds are not forthcoming.
<b>Beneficiary partners</b>				

Stakeholder group	Strengths	Weakness	Opportunities	Threats
<b>Communal conservancies</b>	Grass roots structures. Represents the communities	Leadership and capacity of staff does not match the complexity of management and leadership required		Though poor and / or ineffective management and leadership, losses political and public support, resulting in abortive devolution, i.e. rights are withdrawn
<b>Regional conservancy associations</b>	Represents the conservancies	Not focused and strategic. Unable to form a national platform where the needs are greatest.	Does provide a representative platform for conservancies	Sustainability
<b>Regional government</b>		Have limited support / understanding of the Conservancy programme (there are some exceptions)	Coordinator and in some cases matching of development needs that are being supported by Conservancies.	Due to poor performance of conservancies could lobby for the demise of conservancies rights.
<b>Minimum support service providers</b>				
<b>WWF</b>	Fund raising, technical support	Overloaded	Good reputation – global footprint	Key staff leaving with no succession / replacement in place
<b>NASCO Secretariat</b>	Politically recognised and appreciated.	Secretariat limited capacity. Currently dependence on WWF for funding	Coordination of CBNRM support	Secretariat over-extends itself though demands and then loses focus.
<b>IRDNC</b>	Field based support. Raises own funds	Capacity good at community level, but limited with cooperate governance support requirements of conservancies		Requires significant funding to keep going. Unable to deliver on conservancies technical support requirement needs

Stakeholder group	Strengths	Weakness	Opportunities	Threats
<b>NNF</b>	Not dependent on NACSO and CBNRM, independent board Good leadership Building up reputation	Possible under staffing due to financial constraints	Involvement in broader biodiversity economy – cross linkages to a wide range of projects that can strengthen interventions with Conservancies	Access to funding
<b>Other support NGOs</b>	Existing relationships with conservancies and involved in the CBNRM programme	Not all are self-financing / raise own funds, so depend on financial support in order to provide services to conservancies	Existing links to communities can be enhanced through synergies and coordination	NGOs act independently in their areas, creating disharmony in the CBNRM national program
<b>Species focussed Trusts / foundations</b>				
<b>Cheetah Conservation Fund (CCFN) NACSO member</b>	World renown	Works very independently of others Not closely linked to communal conservancies	Potential linkages to financing	
<b>Save the Rhino Trust (SRT) NACSO member</b>	Recognised partner of MET			
<b>Desert Lion Project</b>	Outstanding data on desert lions and on conflict	One man NGO.	Solid knowledge and data to back up management needs	One man only.
<b>Donors and development community</b>				
<b>Banks</b>	Approachable	Too conservative. Unwilling to invest in rural areas without strong collateral.	Capital	
<b>Private Sector partners</b>				

Stakeholder group	Strengths	Weakness	Opportunities	Threats
<b>Tourism Sector</b>	Long term investment considerable employment and fees Increase value of wildlife	Lodge operators and community residents have different priorities when it comes to problem animals.	Developing wildlife credit scheme	Benefits not reaching the majority of community members may lead to disruption of programme and tourism product
<b>Hunting concessions</b>	High fee payments to conservancies, and seen to be dealing with problem animals.			International community ban import of trophy
<b>Insurance sector</b>	Approachable		Willing to consider innovation	Scale of economic return does not warrant the level of supported required