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FOREWORD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</th>
<th>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Action Loan Scheme</td>
<td>AALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Bank of Namibia</td>
<td>AGRIBANK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform Act, 1995</td>
<td>ACLRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Committee on Land and Social Issues</td>
<td>CCLSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal Land Boards</td>
<td>CLBs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial / High Economic Value Model</td>
<td>HEVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Establishment or Start-up Grant</td>
<td>DESG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
<td>GDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Development and Maintenance Grant</td>
<td>IDMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition Committee</td>
<td>LAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition and Development Fund</td>
<td>LADF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Credit Facility Allocation</td>
<td>LCFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Reform Advisory Commission</td>
<td>LRRAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Reform and Resettlement Programme</td>
<td>LRRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of the Republic of Namibia</td>
<td>GRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry</td>
<td>MAWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Tourism</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Land Reform</td>
<td>MLR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>MoF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia Agricultural Union</td>
<td>NAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia National Farmers Union</td>
<td>NNFU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia Power Corporation</td>
<td>NAMPOWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia Water Corporation</td>
<td>NAMWATER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Planning Commission</td>
<td>NPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Resettlement Policy</td>
<td>NRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Attorney General</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Technical Team</td>
<td>PTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Councils</td>
<td>RCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Resettlement Committees</td>
<td>RRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Cabinet Committee on Land and Related Matters</td>
<td>SCCLRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern African Development Community</td>
<td>SADC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Commercial / Moderate Economic Value Model</td>
<td>MEVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Economic Value Model</td>
<td>LEVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Owned Enterprises</td>
<td>SOEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Committee on Land and Social Issues</td>
<td>TCLSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Coordination Team on Land Reform</td>
<td>TCTLR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Support Provision</td>
<td>TSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Authorities</td>
<td>TAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing Seller – Willing Buyer</td>
<td>WS-WB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Glossary of Concepts, Terms and Jargons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept / term</th>
<th>Description / Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Farming unit</td>
<td>Refers to a surveyed land holding (subdivided / not subdivided) acquired by government and made available for allotment in terms of Sections 38 and 39 of the Agricultural (commercial) Land Reform Act, 1995 (Act No. 6 of 1995).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Landless</td>
<td>Refers to those Namibian citizens (Previously Disadvantaged Namibians) who do not own or otherwise have the use of any or of adequate agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Previously Disadvantaged Namibian(s) (PDN)</td>
<td>These are Namibian citizens who have been socially, economically or educationally disadvantaged by past discriminatory laws or practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Resettlement</td>
<td>A process of land allocation which aim to ensure the fair and equitable distribution of state acquired agricultural (commercial) land to previously disadvantaged landless Namibian citizens who do not own or otherwise have the use of agricultural land or adequate agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction
Unequal land distribution stemming from Namibia’s colonial history remains a post-independence political and socio-economic challenge. Redressing this imbalance pertaining to land distribution and improving the quality of life of the previously disadvantaged landless Namibians forms the broad objective of the country’s National Resettlement Policy which was endorsed as early as 2001.

The aim of Namibia’s Land Reform and Resettlement Programme (LRRP) is not only to write past colonial wrongs, but also to achieve social and economic equity for all its citizens (PTT: 2005). While the latter remains the broader aim of the programme, the effectiveness of the existing National Resettlement Policy (2001) has been put to question especially given the perpetuation of unequal distribution of social capital and control of land mainly by whites so many years after independence.

With the passing of time, criticism of this policy’s inability to enable the undoing of past colonial wrongs and affording real economic empowerment to the beneficiaries has seemingly been gathering strong support and momentum among the general public. Some criticism hinges on the fact that the land acquired has not been put to proper use by most of those it has been allocated to. Given this situation, the Government through Cabinet decision number SP/17.02.15/001 has sanctioned a comprehensive review the National Resettlement Policy (2001) in order to ensure that the revised policy is aligned to the current reality of land reform post-independence.

The review is further aimed at enhancing the policy’s effectiveness in terms of addressing the issue of equity in the distribution of the land acquired while at the same time, ensuring political and socio-economic sustainability. By so doing, government hopes that no Namibian citizen should feel left out by the dictates of the reviewed policy.

2. Background
Land Reform and Resettlement is still a multidimensional issue in Namibia and its political landscape. Redistributing land with the aim to alleviate poverty is both an economic and political aim of resettlement. The National Resettlement Policy (2001) is among the key policies that were developed to aid and guide government’s post land redistribution efforts post-land acquisition. Nonetheless, in the absence of a consolidated Land Act, the country’s land mass which measures about 82,426,900 hectares in extent remain divided into communal and commercial land sectors with the former still being predominantly occupied by black peasants (Resettlement Programme, 2001 – 2005). The reforms of communal and commercial land are therefore guided by the Communal Land Reform Act, 2002 (Act No. 5 of 2002) and the Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform Act, 1995 (Act No.6 of 1995), respectively. The National Resettlement Policy is therefore a post land acquisition policy that deals primarily with the redistribution of agricultural (commercial) land acquired under the Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform Act to previously disadvantaged landless Namibians.
Under the national Resettlement Programme, the Government targets to acquire and distribute 5 million hectares of commercial agricultural land and of this target 513 commercial farms totalling 3.1 million hectares of land has been acquired and allocated to over 5300 beneficiaries either as individuals, groups, cooperatives and or group resettlement projects. Although Government acknowledges in the Resettlement Policy (2001) that there are no definite figures of people in need of resettlement, it estimated a total of 243 000 Namibians in need of land. Therefore using this figure as the only available official estimate, it would mean that only about 2.2% of this total have been reached despite the fact that over 62.81% of the targeted land has been acquired for resettlement.

Given the above state of affairs, it is important for many Namibians to acknowledge the fact there is not enough agricultural (commercial) land available to cover the ever increasing number of Namibians eligible for resettlement. The poverty situation of many such Namibians cannot be addressed via land reform alone hence, it is important that other avenues must be explored to meet the economic empowerment expectations of many previously disadvantaged Namibians.

The National Resettlement Policy which was developed and approved in 2001 has not been revised since hence, a number of gaps have been identified that require address through a review of this policy and these include:

a) **Unfair allocation of acquired land**: Some feel that the land acquired is being allocated to those without capacity to put it to productive use. On the other hand, the less privileged feel that current selection criteria favours the already privileged or well-off individuals, land reform according to them should rather aim to address the poverty situation of the impoverished.

b) **Poor agricultural productivity on allocated land**: Even in the absence of monitoring and evaluation, it is evident that agricultural production on most resettlement farms is poor. This sporadic and low incomes on many resettlement farms is attributed to numerous reasons such as lack of skills, lack of training and insecure land tenure rights, while other common challenges include namely; labour issues, marketing issues, poor farm infrastructure, water scarcity, limited credit facilities, land size, animal diseases and stock theft, etc..

c) **Absence of pre- and post-settlement support**: The absence of well-structured and coordinated support to resettlement beneficiaries is attributed, mainly as the reason for the poor agricultural productivity on most resettlement farms. Most resettlement farms suffer from a lack of management capacity and basic agricultural skills hence, their perpetual reliance on government support.
d) **Lack of effective monitoring and evaluation of the resettlement process**: The absence of effective monitoring and evaluation is attributed as one of the major reasons for the poor performance of agriculture on the majority of resettlement farms. No national statistics or proper records exist in the Ministry of Land Reform with regards to the level of farm production by resettled farmers. This therefore makes it difficult to apply corrective measures required to aid production on resettlement farms.

e) **Poor stakeholder involvement and coordination**: The lack of key stakeholder involvement and role fulfillment is seen as one of the setbacks to the land reform and resettlement programme in general. This is despite the listing of such role players and their roles in the National Resettlement Policy, 2001.

3. **Rationale for and Purpose of the National Resettlement Policy**

In line with the evolving challenges facing the Land Reform and Resettlement Programme and given the ever changing dynamics/landscape thereof, the relevance of the existing policy framework needs to be reviewed regularly in order to ensure that it remains appropriate to today’s prevailing needs, expectations, preferences and even more so, to the critical issues now confronting the institutions for land reform and overall programme implementation.

Gathering from the Ministry’s lessons learned in implementing the current National Resettlement Policy (NRP), it is realisable that the non-review of this policy 16 years after its adoption is not only a challenge for implementer(s), but could also lead to the loss of innovative practical thoughts aimed at aiding the implementation process. In light, therefore, the lessons tapped from the implementation of the current policy calls for a more focussed and consistent approach for reviewing this policy framework as both an administrative and political imperative.

Notwithstanding the above, it is a fact that, Land Reform and Resettlement in Namibia since the country’s independence still remains a complex issue. The presence of a greater number of Namibians with varying interests and expectations particularly on the reform and redistribution of agricultural (commercial) land complicates the process of land reform and resettlement even further. Therefore, the rational and purpose of the Revised National Resettlement Policy is to:

a) **enhance guidance and give further direction to the ongoing implementation of the land reform and resettlement programme, while tapping from implementation experience and lessons learned so far,**

b) **review and consolidate thoughts of the multitude of stakeholders in the land reform and resettlement programme in order to bring about a coherent resettlement policy document that addresses the possible lack of efficacy in the existing policy.**

In summary, the review aims to introduce a comprehensive resettlement policy instrument for addressing landlessness amongst the multitude of previously disadvantaged Namibians in an
efficient and effective manner. The revised Policy will serve to build on and enhance current efforts by Government and the various stakeholders in the resettlement programme while focusing to address the challenges listed above.

4. **Alignment to Existing Policy / Legal Instruments**

In its quest to address the land reform and resettlement challenges in the country, the Government of the Republic of Namibia (GRN) through the Ministry of Land Reform has since independence managed to develop and implement a number of policies and legislation to guide the implementation of the Land Reform and Resettlement Programme. This policy review has therefore been conducted consistent with the provisions of some key policies and legislations, including planning instruments as established to aid the LRRP. Key ones are:

a) *The Constitution of the Republic of Namibia,*
b) *The Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform Act, 1995 (Act No.6 of 1995),*
c) *The Communal Land Reform Act, 2002 (Act No. 5 of 2002),*
d) *The draft Land Bill, 2010,*
e) *The National Land Policy, 1998,*
f) *The Permanent Technical Team (PTT) report on land reform, 2005,*
g) *Vision 2030,* and  
h) *The National Development Plans.*

5. **Guiding Principles**

This policy adopts the fundamental and guiding principles stipulated in the Draft Land Bill (2010). The principles entail that “all persons performing functions and duties in terms of this Policy and the applicable legislations shall when interpreting and applying provisions of this Policy and the applicable laws pertaining thereto, have regard and give effect to –

(a) the nation’s commitment to address, in accordance with the Namibian Constitution, injustices of the past which included disposessions, discrimination and inequitable access to and unequal distribution of land under colonialism and apartheid;

(b) provide for a unitary land system, where Namibian citizens have equal rights, opportunities and security with regard to land, irrespective of where the land is situated;

(c) make special provisions, as part of the land reform process, in the allocation of land to Namibian citizens who -

(i) do not own or otherwise have the use of any or of adequate land, and foremost to those Namibian citizens who have been socially, economically or educationally disadvantaged by past discriminatory laws or practices in accordance with Article 23 of the Namibian Constitution;

(ii) are unemployed, incapacitated, indigent and disadvantaged pursuant to Article 95(g) of the Namibian Constitution to enable them to live a life which recognises their inherent dignity as members of the human family;
(d) the nation’s commitment to land reform to bring about equitable access to Namibia’s land resources, in order to address the results of racial discriminatory laws or practices made under colonialism and apartheid;

(e) to ensure that there is established an independent, expeditious, cost effective and just system for adjudication of land disputes which will hear and determine land disputes fairly and without delay;

(f) to ensure the productive use of land in compliance with the principles of sustainable use for the benefit of present and future generations in accordance with Article 95 (l) of the Namibian Constitution;

(g) to ensure that payment of just compensation for expropriation of property or rights thereof must reflect an equitable balance between the public interest, which includes the nation’s commitment to land reform, and the rights of those affected;

(h) to provide for an efficient, effective, economical and transparent system of land administration and accountability of public officials”.

6. Vision

Ensure a demand driven and evidence based National Resettlement Policy that is relevant and responsive to the current and future land needs of the landless Namibians citizens.

7. Mission

The policy seeks to build on the Ministry’s existing corporate mission which is, “to ensure that Namibia’s land resource is equitably allocated, efficiently managed, administered and sustainably utilized for the benefit of all Namibians” (GRN, MLR Strat Plan, 2012 – 2017). This is achievable through advocating equitable and transparent distribution of and access to land and sustainable occupation and utilisation thereof.

8. Goal of Resettlement

The goal is to redress the imbalance pertaining to land distribution and ensure that land acquired is fairly and equitably allocated and sustainably utilised in order to improve the quality of life of destitute and landless previously disadvantaged Namibians. By so doing, enable the beneficiaries to become economically independent and self-sufficient in food production and make a contribution to the country’s economy.

This is achievable through a systematic allocation of land acquired for this purpose as per the dictations of the Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform Act, 1995 (Act. No. 6 of 1995) to eligible and qualifying beneficiaries while ensuring that those resettled are provided with the necessary pre- and post-resettlement support as suggested hereinafter.

Further, sustainable structures should be developed and an enabling environment ought to be created under which those resettled should take control of themselves and their activities.
on their various resettlement destinations and further be able to stand on their own with their families without much dependency on government support.

9. **Objectives of Resettlement**

In his State of the Nation Address (2017) while answering to some questions from Parliamentarians, President Hage G. Geingob remarked that “the land question should not be confined to redistribution, but also take into account the need to increase agricultural productivity”. The LRRP aims to enable resettled people to become economically self-reliant, to participate in the wider economy and to create jobs (PTT: 2005). This wider definition implies that the reform and resettlement process should aim to meet both the political and socio-economic expectations of all Namibian Citizens. Therefore, critical to the realisation of this aim and the success of the redistributive land reform programme is government’s ability to balance and aim for an equilibrium in trying to meet the socio-economic (Development) and political (Equity) objectives of land reform as defined hereunder.

- **Socio-Economic (Development) objective** – this requires that the land acquired should be allocated to those with not only the will but also ability to cultivate it and who can contribute to the gross domestic product of the country. It presupposes that land (unless accompanied with structured tailored pre- and post-settlement support) should not be allocated to those without the will and ability (means) to put it to productive use as doing so would be self-defeating and arguably not in public interest. Given the fact that the land acquired for redistribution is under production, the ideal is to perpetuate productive land use activities post land acquisition and resettlement thus, ensuring that the economic contribution of all acquired farm land is not lost as a result of land reform.

- **Political (Equity) objective** – this is an objective aimed at ensuring equity. It requires that land be acquired and allocated to eligible previously disadvantaged landless Namibians regardless of their economic status. It aims at ensuring that land is acquired and equitably distributed in order to ensure the attainment of racial equity in terms of access to and ownership of land in the country. It builds on the political rhetoric that Namibia’s liberation struggle was all about land thus, all landless previously disadvantaged citizens are in one way or the other entitled to access to and ownership of land in post independent Namibia.

Both of the objectives above form the broader objective of the Land Reform and Resettlement Programme which this policy should aim to address. However, striking a balance in terms of achieving these objectives will remain a challenge to the implementers especially when it comes to ensuring the attainment of an equilibrium with regards to the fulfilment of both of these objectives.

The two broader objectives above can be summarised as - (a) to achieve equity in land distribution and, (b) to ensure productivity of redistributed land and perpetuate economic gains derived from such land post land reform. In this regard the revised policy aims to build
on current objective which is, “to resettle eligible Namibian citizens through institutionally, sociologically, economically and environmentally sustainable approaches” (National Resettlement Policy: 2001).

In view of the broader objective as spelled out above, this revised Resettlement Policy elected to retain the specific objectives of resettlement as outlined in Resettlement Policy (2001) as they are still deemed relevant and appropriate to the political and economic ideals of Namibia. These are summarised in the table below as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Objective type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) To redress past imbalances in the distribution of land and ensure the attainment of equity.</td>
<td>Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) To give an opportunity to the previously disadvantaged landless Namibian individuals to own and or have access to land for their productive use or which they can claim as their home.</td>
<td>Equity &amp; Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) To offer citizens an opportunity to access agricultural (commercial) farm land where they are able to earn a decent living and also contribute to the Country’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP).</td>
<td>Equity &amp; Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) To bring the communal farmers and other small-holder farmers into the mainstream of the Namibian economy and in so doing, alleviate human and livestock pressure in overcrowded communal areas</td>
<td>Economic &amp; equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) To create employment opportunities through farming and other income generating activities thus, help reduce poverty.</td>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Resettlement Definition

Resettlement is a complex process that could be defined broadly or specifically. In Namibia, resettlement is directly linked to distribution of agricultural (Commercial) land acquired by the State for that purpose. There is however, no widely accepted definition of resettlement but nonetheless, and for the purpose of this policy, resettlement can broadly be defined as a process of land allocation which aim to ensure the fair and equitable distribution of state acquired agricultural (commercial) land to previously disadvantaged landless Namibian citizens who do not own or otherwise have the use of agricultural land or adequate agricultural land.

The resettlement of landless people onto acquired agricultural (commercial) land is a voluntary programme for which eligible citizens purposefully elect to apply to be resettled at their preferred resettlement destination upon the issuance of a public notice in terms of the Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform Act, 1995 (Act No. 6 of 1995). Doing so affords the beneficiaries an opportunity to be allocated land from which they can derive acceptable levels of socio-economic development so that they can support themselves and their families thus,
improve their standard of living and/or quality of life and eventually make meaningful contributions to the country’s GDP.

11. Resettlement Beneficiaries / Target Groups

Restoring and securing the land rights of mainly Black Namibians who had lost their land or whose rights were deemed weak and insecure has been the focus of the National Land Policy, 1998. It is thus no surprise that the preamble of the Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform Act, 1995 (Act No. 6 of 1995) clearly identifies that the beneficiaries of the land acquisition and resettlement programme as “Namibian citizens who do not own or otherwise have the use of agricultural land or adequate agricultural land, and foremost to those Namibians who have been socially, economically or educationally disadvantaged by the past discriminatory laws and practices”. This legal provision in specific terms entails that the beneficiaries or target group of this programme are all Namibians (landless) who were previously disadvantaged and these include the minority / marginalised groups, disadvantaged / destitute groups and women in particular. In summary the target beneficiaries can be grouped in three main groups as follows:

a) Commercial farmers: involved here are citizens engaged in commercial farming on leased farm land from private individual owners, juristic entities or local authorities and whose farming ventures are deemed vulnerable due to highly insecure land rights offered by the nature of their leasehold agreements.

b) Communal farmers: included are mainly communal farmers whose operations are constrained by the environment in which they are operating. These could be small or large-holder farmers commanding relatively successful husbandry ventures. Part of the aim is to ensure the identification of particularly strong farmers and offer them an opportunity to enter the mainstream economy and by doing so, reduce the congestion or over crowdedness in communal areas especially with regards to livestock farmers with between 150 to 300 large stock units (LSU) or 800 small stock units (SSU).

c) None farming individuals: this covers citizens without land or access to any, either in communal or commercial farming areas. These could be individuals with means or no means but who have the potential (i.e academic qualification, farming experience, capital, etc.,) or are able to operate productive or profitable farming ventures if given the opportunity.

12. Beneficiary Eligibility Criteria for Resettlement

The Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform Act, 1995 clearly outlines the general eligibility criteria of the resettlement beneficiaries by stating that those who should benefit from this programme are “Namibian citizens who do not own agricultural land or adequate land for that matter. It goes on to elaborate that such citizens are those that have been disadvantaged
either socially, economically or educationally by the past colonial discriminatory laws and practices”. It should be noted that this description clearly does not prioritise any group(s) of people based on race, colour or creed as potential beneficiaries. This is in keeping with article 10(2) of the Constitution of Namibia which stipulates that “No Persons may be discriminated against on the grounds of sex, race, colour, ethnic origin, creed, or social or economic status”. This in fact carries the government’s message across that it intends to ensure unity of purpose in the redistribution of land.

Further, the National Land Policy adopted in 1998 proposes a unitary land system by directing that, “All citizens have equal rights, opportunities and security across the range or tenure and management system”. Given these Constitutional, legal and or policy provisions on citizens’ rights and eligibility in terms of access to and or ownership of land the general eligibility criteria of potential beneficiaries of resettlement are summarised as follows:

a) Should be at least 21 years old,
b) Resource ownership and or access to capital,
c) Readiness to relocate based on the principal of self-selection,
d) Willingness and preparedness to hold land under leasehold and adhere to the conditions thereof,
e) Willingness and preparedness to relinquish any agricultural land rights held elsewhere based on the principal of fair and equitable land distribution (Beneficiaries should not practise dual grazing),
f) Depending on the resettlement model advanced for the land on offer, beneficiaries should have some background on the land use activity for which the resettlement is based (farming track records).

13. Resettlement Land Occupation Models

It has arguably been mentioned in several occasions by various individuals or groups that the current resettlement models seem to focus mainly on livestock farming thus rendering the bulk of land being offered through the Willing Seller – Willing Buyer (WS-WB) unsuitable for resettlement.

Critical to an effective agricultural (commercial) land reform and resettlement process is the identification of diverse resettlement models with a view to implement broader and effective models that are tailored to the varying land needs of the eligible beneficiaries and which can accommodate the different farming systems being practiced and adaptable in Namibia. This arguably, will enable the acquisition and distribution of the bulk of land being offered to the State through the WS-WB mode of land acquisition.

The implementation of the proposed models requires a clear understanding by all implementers of the land reform programme in terms of identifying the ideal resettlement beneficiaries and how to select among them? In line with the objectives of resettlement as described in this policy, it is critical that beneficiaries (as they are defined in the ACLRA, 1995)
are also profiled and grouped according to the three target groups and occupation models as listed hereafter in order to ease the selection burden while using a uniform selection criteria. This requires the ranking of potential beneficiaries as per the said categories and based on their land needs and within the framework of the two objectives as defined in this policy. In an attempt to fulfil the latter, and with the understanding that “resettlement is intended to cover all kinds of landless, displaced and destitute people in the country (NRP: 2001)”, the following models are suggested to be considered as they are deemed to be socially, economically and politically appropriate:

a) High Economic Value (Commercial) Model (HEVM).

b) Moderate Economic Value Model (Semi-Commercial) Model (MEVM).

c) Low Economic Value Model (LEVM).

13.1 High Economic Value (Commercial) Model (HEVM)

This model targets the empowerment of mainly landless commercial farmers farming on leased commercial (agricultural) lands which is privately owned or belonging to local authorities. It is a model that aim to enable the fulfilment or attainment of the socio-economic (development) objective of the Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform which is to “To enable resettled farmers to become economically self-reliant, to participate in the wider economy and to create jobs” and “To systematically address the existing skewed land ownership by phasing formerly disadvantaged Namibians into the main stream of the national economy” (NRP: 2001).

This model requires that the land acquired should not be partitioned or subdivided into small portions because doing so has proven to be limiting in terms of productivity and environmental protection. Small farming units have proven to be uneconomical and unsustainable from a commercial agricultural and environmental perspectives, especially given the erratic climatic conditions. Therefore allocating small parcels of land indiscriminately to all eligible beneficiaries is tantamount to declaring them all subsistence farmers especially those farming with livestock.

In order to avert the above and to ensure the perpetuity and sustainability of the productive value of the land acquired under the National Resettlement Programme (NRP), acquired farms should be allocated as full undivided entities (i.e. un-partitioned) to carefully selected and tried beneficiaries who are practicing commercial farming on leased land. While the cost of implementing this model may be deemed excessive in the short-term, its long-term benefits are undoubtedly indispensable. The aim is to target a few carefully selected practising farmers who have demonstrated willingness and ability to farm and offer them a chance to access commercial farm land with more secure tenure rights. This models can be implemented within the following framework:
Target primarily applicants / people who are practicing commercial farming on leased commercial farm lands, whose land rights by their nature as leases are considered weak and insecure,

Aim mainly to provide more secure land right to eligible beneficiaries for commercial agricultural purposes,

Targeting already established landless commercial farmers is a sure way to maintain agricultural productivity on farms acquired for resettlement,

Impose no land floor for this model as the land use prescribed by planners could determine the minimum land size required. However, a land ceiling of 7000 hectares is proposed as the maximum, depending on agro-ecological zone in which the farm is situated and also the nature of farming venture or agribusiness suitable for the type of land acquired,

Implementation wise, this is a financially costly model (i.e. cost per hectare per beneficiary, also considering additional cost with regards to possible pre- and post – resettlement support) as it targets the acquisition and allocation of undivided farms to deserving individual beneficiaries who will have to undergo some stringent selection process before being considered for allocation,

Land allocation should be done strictly on a maximum of 10 year leasehold basis depending on the proposed agricultural venture (i.e. land use), with a minimum of three years compulsory rent free probation period which could be extended for a maximum of a further two more years. The determination to extend the probation or terminate the occupation agreement will depend on the observed performance of the candidate beneficiary and their proven farming ability at the end of the principal three year probation period,

The beneficiaries should be able to prove their ability to productively use the land with minimum support from government during the probation period,

Measured / tailored pre- and post-settlement support should be offered right from inception of the resettlement of the beneficiaries depending on the farming venture,

The resettlement lease agreement should be signed or granted at the time of land allocation,

Effective monitoring and evaluation should be ensure in order to enable successful implementation of this model. This could be achieved by linking beneficiaries to farm mentors in the form of a mentorship schemes using willing and able commercial farmers to be identified with the assistance of the organised farmers’ unions. Building the capacities of beneficiaries through mentorship and training by ell established commercial farmers can contribute greatly to the success of resettled farmers,
✓ The beneficiaries must be prepared to buy or vacate the land at the end of the probation period or the 10 year lease. In order to strengthen option to purchase, the lease should be issued with a condition that accords the lessee the first right of refusal to purchase the leased land at the expiry of the probation or the lease by effluxion of time.

✓ Allowing successful beneficiaries to buy their farming units offers them real security of tenure and naturally builds investment confidence in their farmland.

✓ The revenue generated by the State through farming units sells to beneficiaries of such units should be deposited in the LADF in order to fund land reform related expenses.

✓ Option to purchase the farming unit on a cost recovery basis (purchase cost) or less at the end of the probation period should only be applicable to beneficiaries who successfully completes their probation.

✓ The cost recovery (purchase cost) basis is proposed in order to lessen the administrative burden that could be required in determining the level of investment already made by the beneficiaries into the resettlement farms. The cost price being referred to herein is the actual price (minus transfer costs) that government paid in order to purchase the farm. Other costs such as the rehabilitation of infrastructure done by the government could be excluded and considered as subsidy to the lessee(s).

✓ A 10 year resale prohibition clause should be imposed on all successful beneficiaries who at the end of the prohibition period would be willing and able to buy their resettlement land from the State. At the end of the validity of the 10 year prohibition clause the right of first refusal to purchase the land acquired by successful beneficiaries under this mode will be offered to the State (i.e. just as provided for under section 17 of the ACLRA, 1995).

✓ While this model may be seen as a direct competition to Agribank’s Affirmative Action Loan Scheme (AALS), it is rather complimentary in the sense that beneficiaries opting to acquire their farms at the end of their successful probation period, may be assisted to obtain financing from Agribank in order to buy their farm land. Therefore, contributing directly to Agribank’s client base and loan book. In fact the Agribank Act could be amended in order to put this model under the bank’s loan portfolio and management in terms of implementation.

✓ The only drawback of this model is that, huge tracks of agricultural land will be required to resettle few individuals only. Given the fact that only 1.9 million of the 5 million hectares targeted for acquisition under the NRP remain, successful implementation of this model could pose a serious constraint.

13.2 Moderate Economic Value (Semi-Commercial) Model (MEVM)

This models targets established communal farmers whose farming enterprises’ success are threatened by the environment in which they are operating i.e. shared grazing which often
is not well managed. The objective of this model is to “enhance the welfare of the people through improvement of productivity and to enable them to be self-reliant in terms of food security” and “to right past colonial wrongs and to enable all Namibian citizens achieve social and economic equity”. This model thus serves as the bridging model between beneficiaries targeted under the HEVM and LEVM. It targets to provide access to land to people who have demonstrated through their ongoing farming ventures in communal areas that they are able to farm commercially if given the opportunity. This model provides an effective way to decongest overcrowded communal areas as it targets the resettlement of communal farmers especially with large livestock numbers. It builds on the existing practice of buying and partitioning land into farming units in an attempt to cover a wider spectrum of beneficiaries as opposed to the HEVM. It responds to both the political and socio-economic objective of the LRRP by ensuring that the land acquired is subdivided into semi-commercial farming units for allotment to eligible beneficiaries.

The beneficiaries under this model are expected to ensure that the land allocated to them is productively utilized by engaging in meaningful agricultural activities which may not necessarily be at full commercial farming capacity levels. The following parameters serve as guidelines for the implementation of this model:

- **Provision of land to well established farmers in communal areas and bringing them into the main stream economy is the aim,**

- **No minimum land sizes are suggested but depending on agro-ecological zone where the farm is located, allotment units of any size but not exceeding 3000 hectares (central going north) and 7000 hectares (central going south), respectively may be allocated,**

- **Moderate to high cost of acquisition can be expected to be incurred. However, the cost per capita when compared to the high value model will be lower given the fact that the acquired land will be subdivided/partitioned into farming units for allocation to more than one person thus, covering a wider spectrum of beneficiaries,**

- **A compulsory rent free probation period of at least three (3) years should be observed by prospective beneficiaries with a formal lease being granted right from the inception of the lease. Beneficiaries who fail to satisfy the probation conditions should be discarded from the farm (during or at the end of the probation period) in favour of other eligible and more capable beneficiaries,**

- **Strict monitoring and evaluation must be observed in order to enable the successful implementation of this model. Again the use of well-established commercial farmers as mentors is highly recommended here,**

- **A maximum of 50 year renewable, inheritable and transferable lease may be granted to beneficiaries who successfully completes their probation,**

- **In order to offer successful beneficiaries an opportunity to own land and avoid being perpetual lessees of the State, an option to purchase the farming units after the probation
period should be allowed to such beneficiaries on a cost recovery basis or less. Just as in the HEVM, the cost recovery suggested is the actual purchase price of the land. This is suggested in order to eliminate the administrative burden that could result from the need to objectively identify and accurately quantify and qualify the level of investment effected by existing resettlement farmers who may opt to buy their farming units,

- Depending on the agri-venture or land use type, measured/tailored pre- and post-settlement support should be provided to the beneficiaries during the probation period, where-after they are expected to be self-reliant and self-supportive.

- As this model conforms to the current approach of land allocation, it could be implemented with ease while ensuring that those resettled at least 3 or more years ago prior to the implementation of this policy, could also be afforded an opportunity to buy their land without subjecting them to a probation period as proposed but rather, a stringent selection criteria should be applied in order to ensure the empowerment of only those who have proven themselves to be capable farmers,

- Successful beneficiaries who qualify to buy their farming units may be assisted to obtain funding from Agribank at subsidised or special interest rates,

- It should be mentioned that allowing beneficiaries an option to acquire their farming units will accord the State a simple but sure way to identify serious resettled farmers from mediocre ones, especially given the fact that it has been a challenge to apply effective monitoring and evaluation of the performance of those resettled. This model therefore presents itself as an effective self-selection mechanism that will enable government to apply some form of evaluation of the success of the current reform initiatives by distinguishing and discriminating among productive and none-productive resettlement beneficiaries so far.

13.3 Low Economic Value Model (LEVM)

This model leans heavily on the socio-political aspect of land reform as it targets landless citizens who are neither farming in communal areas nor leasing on privately owned commercial farmland. It also includes those with or without capital, those with access to capital (bank loans, cash or livestock) or are low to medium income earners or have no income. It aims to contribute to the objective i.e. “To enhance the welfare of the people through provision of destination areas where potential beneficiaries are supposed to earn a decent living”. It recognizes the fact that quite a significant number of previously disadvantaged Namibians e.g. former farm workers, retired professionals or pensioners who were in formal employment in various sectors have no income and secure place to live. These people may not necessarily be farmers but they too need land to sustain themselves by erecting dwelling and perhaps a small garden or enough land to keep a few livestock. Currently, the only option available to them is to apply for a resettlement farming units in
competition with all other potential beneficiaries as the farms are being advertised by the Government for resettlement.

This model therefore presents an option or opportunity for people that arguably feel they have been left out under the current land reform practices. These are eligible beneficiaries who do not want to become commercial farmers, but are landless and need land for resettlement where they should have access not only to land but also to basic services such as secure housing, water and sanitation and social services. It further responds to the need to recognize the fact that there are low or no income earners with various land needs and that this resettlement model is purposefully tailored to respond to such needs which may include any land based activity such as tailoring, brick making, poultry, piggery, horticulture, floriculture, aquaculture, Cropping (vegetable gardening), etc..

By allowing people to engage in the above albeit on a small-scale level, it offers them an opportunity to fend for themselves and generally lessen their dependence on government support. Therefore, post-settlement support in the form of housing, infrastructure, knowledge and skills could carefully be offered to this category of beneficiaries in order to afford them an opportunity to develop and maintain their new environment and gradually ensure self-reliance.

This model is suggested with the understanding that, resettlement is expected to meet both the social and economic goals of the LRRP. It is felt by some citizens that under the current resettlement selection criteria, majority of those that have been resettled are those who could be described as the economically well off individuals or families. This model is therefore recommended to be implemented within the following parameters:

- Target people with low or no income, no or very few assets and who have no form of capital or access thereto and who are landless and need land for resettlement to call their home or livelihood base.
- Unlike the HEVM and MEVM models, beneficiaries under this model are (although highly encouraged to) not expected to undertake commercial agricultural activities of significance on their resettlement land as the objective is to provide them with shelter and secure land tenure rights where they can produce enough to feed themselves and their families.
- The main aim here is the provision of land mainly for small-scale farming operations and for refuge where people could call home and they could be allocated perpetual rights of occupation (99 year lease) valid for their life time with no lease fees applicable. Upon the death of the primary beneficiary, the right should also be transferable or inheritable among close family members only and in the absence of close family members to succeed, the right would revert to the State for reallocation to other eligible beneficiaries.
✓ No probation is therefore required for this category of settlers / beneficiaries, however they too can be offered an option to buy their resettlement parcels with the same conditions as the other two models.
✓ The size of land rights allocated under this model may range from any size but not exceeding a maximum of 50 hectares;
✓ Land on the periphery of urban areas (although susceptible to town expansion) is deemed ideal for acquisition to benefit primarily this model. Given the proximity of such land to towns, beneficiaries could be afforded an opportunity to seek employment in nearby towns in order to support themselves and their families,
✓ Since small parcels which are close to town are the target, high cost of acquisition can be expected,
✓ As the category of beneficiaries are the poorest of the two categories discussed above, they require targeted support if they are to succeed in terms of improving their livelihoods. Therefore, a once-off full GRN settlement subsidy or start-up grant in the form of housing or other physical assets may be offered to the beneficiaries to help them settle.

It should be noted that the successful implementation of the above models depends on the extent to which their target beneficiaries are exposed to tailored pre- and post-settlement support packages as suggested herein.

14. Land Allocation / Distribution Modalities
The identification, profiling and selection of beneficiaries remain a daunting exercise that seemingly have failed to meet the expectations of many. The question remain that, are those who were allocated the land under the current system using it to the greater good of Namibia and if not, how can the current system be repositioned to address this challenge? Given this dilemma, this policy review framework proposes three modalities of resettlement of which each is focussed at addressing the specific land needs of the target beneficiaries while taking into cognizance the key objectives of this policy from a political and socio-economic perspective.

In light of the above this policy review suggests that the current resettlement selection criteria be modified and tailored in favour of the specific models of resettlement suggested herein and that the land acquired and made available for allotment should be targeted towards beneficiaries falling within a specific resettlement model. This entails that in order to limit competitions across beneficiaries of the various models when it comes to applying for resettlement, land will be identified, profiled and acquired targeting specifically the resettlement of potential beneficiaries under a given model. This means that, prior to acquisition of any land offered to the State for resettlement, profiling of such land will have to be done in order to match it to a specific resettlement model and subsequently acquired to resettle beneficiaries identified under such model. Doing so will limit the current speculative tendency of acquiring land and only to look for potential beneficiaries then after.
15. **Land Occupation Arrangements / Tenure Rights**

It is worth noting that land is not about ownership but, about how one can capitalise on any form of access thereto to unlock investment. However, the lack of tenure security for resettlement farmers due to the speculative nature of the current 99 year lease remain a grey area. In this regard, the proposed resettlement models suggests that land should first be allocated on a leasehold basis with the option for a freehold right being granted to successful beneficiaries upon meeting the probation requirements and subsequently exercising their option to purchase their leaseholds.

Allowing successful beneficiaries to buy their farming units offers them the opportunity to own their farm land and avoid them being perpetual lessees of the State. This will also certainly clear the current uncertainty regarding the inability of resettlement beneficiaries to use their lease agreements as collateral to access credit from commercial banks. It could be argued that the current inability of most beneficiaries to access commercial credit is but one of the key reasons for them being unable to farm successfully.

The duration of the lease is varied depending on the resettlement model with the suggestion to provide tailored pre- and post-settlement support in the form of support services and starting capital to resettled farmers. The sub-lease option currently provided for in the current Agricultural (Commercial) Land Act, 1995 should be scrapped as it cultivates none productive use of land and poses an opportunity cost to those that would have used the land by themselves should they have been resettled.

In order to ensure effective implementation of the lease agreement entered into with the beneficiaries and to also raise funds to support the reform programme in general, the implementing ministry in collaboration with key role players should as a matter of necessity workout mechanism for the billing and collection of leasehold fees. These fees should be deposited in the Land Acquisition and Development Fund (LADF) to be used as a revolving funding component to support resettled farmers and also for land acquisition.

16. **Pre-settlement Support**

It is a fact that what happens before and after physical resettlement of beneficiaries sets these beneficiaries for failure or success. Resettlement farms should be operated such that pre-farm acquisition productivity is maintained. There is therefore, need to ensure that those selected and allocated land for resettlement should be properly inducted in order to give them the basic foundation for farming success. Effective pre-settlement support interventions that are linked to the identified models of resettlement have to be investigated and formulated in order to benefit newcomers to the commercial farming environment. Such options could include mandatory pre-settlement qualifying training as a prerequisite, linking the beneficiaries to mentors, offering relocation support accompanied with a once off start-up grant.
Reference should thus be made to the PTT report (2005) which suggests various resettlement support packages. Pre- & post-settlement support packages tailored to each of the proposed models be developed, using the PTT proposals as a basis. These packages should thus be reviewed in order to make them relevant to the suggested models and their financial values also be scaled up in order to reflect current financial needs of each model.

17. Post-Settlement Support

Concurrent post-settlement investment support is crucial for sustainable agricultural resettlement. The PTT report (2005) states that post-settlement support interventions have a positive influence on the success of the resettled farmers. Therefore, the need to design optimum post-settlement support packages for the proposed resettlement models is an imperative for the success of resettlement farmers. Given this eminent need, the PTT report indicates that such post settlement support packages internationally are calculated at 2/3 of the land acquisition cost.

The report further suggested the introduction of appropriate packages for Namibia that are benchmarked both within the Southern African Development Community (SADC) region and internationally. In view therefore and for the purpose of this policy review, it is strongly recommended that the post-settlement support packages as proposed by the PTT be considered still relevant for adoption and systematic implementation subject to review based on current agricultural input costs. Such implementation should take into cognizance the specific support needs of the potential beneficiaries of each of the three resettlement models proposed herein.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Beneficiary Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Direct Establishment or Start-up Grant (DESG)</td>
<td>Effective support and financing programmes is key to farming success. This package is a pre-resettlement or start-up support aimed at setting the beneficiaries on the positive start to their commercial farming journey. The grant would among others offer start-up means in the form of relocation support, induction training, restocking, tilling, wildlife breeding stock seed capital and other support required by new beneficiaries to</td>
<td>LEVM &amp; MEVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b) Infrastructure Development/Rehabilitation Grant (IDRG)</strong></td>
<td>The provision of fencing materials, inputs, water tanks and training are key ingredients to farming success. This is a bridging grant aimed at ensuring that new beneficiaries are enabled to build on their existing capacities especially during the 1st year of resettlement. This will mean that they will not have to use their stock or start-up capital to address the infrastructure challenges (i.e. water and fencing) on their resettlement farms. This could come in the form of a farm infrastructure development or rehabilitation by the relevant ministry prior to or immediately after the physical resettlement of beneficiaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c) Technical Support Provision (TSP).</strong></td>
<td>Building the capabilities of beneficiaries through mentorship and training is imperative to farming success by resettlement beneficiaries. This package presents an ongoing support to all resettled farmers. It could come in the form of capacity building trainings (i.e. farming system approaches, general farm management, farm infrastructure management, veterinary issues, marketing etc.). This support could be made available during the probation period of the beneficiaries covering two to five years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d) Limited Credit Facility Allocation (LCFA).</strong></td>
<td>Farming is a capital intensive undertaking thus, the need for readily available and easily accessible sustainable credit facility to cater to the imminent farming needs of the new farmers. The loan grant available at Agribank for resettlement farmers thus need to be expanded to cater for the wider needs of the resettlement farmers other than stocking alone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from the PTT Report: 2005
18. Implementation Arrangements

In order to achieve the intentions of the above support arrangements, it is important to recognise the need for strong collaborations among key role players in the LRRP. The current reality is that the Ministry of Land Reform has almost single handedly been implementing the LRRP with very little support from the majority of stakeholders namely; State Organisation, Semi-State Actors and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), producers associations and unions, etc. In order to avoid this occurrence, it is recommended that rendering and or implementation of various resettlement support packages be afforded to line Ministries and other service providers such as reputable financial institutions and other competent government and none government organisations such as those mentioned hereafter.

19. Institutional Implementation Arrangements

It should be highlighted from the onset that, while it is expected from the Ministry of Land Reform to improve coordination, implementation and monitoring of the resettlement process, it should not be this entity’s responsibility to monitor and ensure fulfilment of roles and responsibility of the various key stakeholders in the LRRP. While it is important for the MLR to be the linking pin in the implementation of the LRRP, improved inter-ministerial planning and coordination is critical to the attainment of goals and objectives of this policy. While a flexible policy approach is advocated in this regard, bilateral and multilateral resource mobilisation is required to successfully implement this policy. The following internal and external institutions are identified to be key stakeholders in the Land Reform and Resettlement Programme:

19.1.1 Government Institutions

a) Cabinet Committee on Land and Social Issues (CCLSI)

Despite the identification of key stakeholders and their roles in the NRP (2001) and the stated need for coordinated efforts of various institutions in the land reform process, the MLR has found it tough to coordinate the roles of other OMAs because it is not equipped legally to compel them to fulfil their roles. Given this reality, it is imperative that the existing Cabinet Committee of Lands and Social Issues (CCLSI) continues to provide policy directives to allocate and compel line institutions to fulfil their roles in the implementation of the LRRP.

b) Technical Committee on Land and Social Issues (TCLSI).

Aiding the work of the CCLSI should be the Technical Committee on Lands and Social Issues (TCLSI). This committee would ensure the translation of cabinet policy directive into programmes and initiatives that are implemented at sectoral level by line institutions. In order to ensure the effectiveness of this committee, a plan of action on implementation of this policy provisions in terms of stakeholder roles will have to be adopted and implemented collaboratively. In order to avoid repeat of the current situation in which majority of role players have very little understanding and knowledge of the tasks assigned to them in the NRP (2001), this platform could serve as the formal mechanism to inform them of their duties and compel them to fulfil their roles unconditionally.
c) **Technical Coordination Team on Land Reform and Resettlement (TCTLR)**

This is one of the key mechanisms that are proposed under the PTT report (2005) to be established under the MLR to execute functions of consultations, coordination, monitoring and evaluation of the day-to-day implementation of specific tasks allocated to line institutions. The PTT report suggest that this committee should consists of technical staff with broad knowledge on land reform policies, and land reform issues, knowledge of natural resource management, land economics, land tenure and land/property law and social and Rural development. The following are the main functions of the TCTLR:

1. Develop and coordinate the implementation of the Land Reform Action Plan (LRAP).
2. Develop and agree on a monitoring and evaluation mechanism.
3. Support the MLR and other line institutions in the execution of their roles regarding to LRRP.
4. Provide Secretarial Services to the TCLSI.
5. Coordinate land reform initiatives on non-government institutions.
6. Prepare regular progress reports on LRRP for the TCLSI.
7. Convene stakeholder forums to discuss issues pertaining to the LRRP.

d) **The Land Reform Advisory Commission (LRAC).**

Established under the ACLRA, 1995, to execute function as stipulated therein, the advisory role of the commission is key in shaping the direction of the LRRP especially when it comes to identification, profiling and acquisition of agricultural land targeted towards the three main models of resettlement and equally important, the identification profiling and selection of resettlement beneficiaries. The commission should also assist in making recommendation in terms of how the remainder 1.9 million hectares of land could be acquired and allocated among the proposed categories and the proportions thereof.

e) **The Land Acquisition Committee (LAC)**

This is a committee of technical staff from line institutions that are assembled based on their expected role in the LRRP to offer pre-land acquisition technical support and advice. Their role is primary to qualify (scrutinise, assess and evaluate) land offered for resettlement by making recommendations to the LRAC as to whether to purchase the land on offer or note. Key to their functions would be the identification, profiling and acquisition of suitable agricultural (commercial) land for resettlement with the focus to match the land offered to the suggested resettlement model. The following constitutes this committee:

- Ministry of Land Reform (MLR).
- Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF).
- Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET).
- Ministry of Urban and Rural Development (MURD).
- Ministry of Finance (MoF).
- National Planning Commission (NPC).
- Office of the Attorney General (AG).
- Ministry of Justice (MoJ).
f) **Regional Resettlement Committees (RRC).**

Established under the ACLR, 1995 as amended, these are regional committees that are responsible for the identification, profiling and selection of suitable candidates and recommend them for resettlement to the LRAC. Their membership should be drawn from key regional role players in the LRRP. Since these are subcommittees of the commission, their functions with regards to pre- and post-settlement support activities will be aided through guidelines provided to them by the LRAC which will also dictate the composition of the committees.

g) **Ministry of Land Reform (MLR).**

This is the implementing ministry as it carries the primary mandate to do so. The ministry will be responsible to facilitate and ensure the establishment and operation of various institutional mechanisms such as the LRAC, RRCs, TCTLR and others suggested herein. This Ministry also primarily carries the full responsibility to ensure relevant budgetary provision for land acquisition and related functions, including funding required for post- and pre-settlement support. Overall, the MLR is also responsible for the day-to-day management activities related to the implementation of the LRRP.

h) **Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF).**

This Ministry has a critical role in the successful implementation of the LRRP. Its expertise is important to both pre- and post-land acquisition activities as it relates to the resettlement of farmers and their support. The provision of vital support in the form of rangeland issues, extension and training services, veterinary services, farm infrastructure particularly water provision, installation, maintenance is critical.

i) **Ministry of Urban and Rural Development (MURD).**

The Ministry of Urban and Rural Development, together with Regional Councils is key in the housing and sanitation needs of the resettlement beneficiaries especially model three (Low Economic Value Model). Their involvement in this programme key in the provision of alternative housing modalities and sanitation that could directly benefit the settlers most of whom are allocated land without any housing and sanitation.

j) **Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET).**

Land use diversity is key to the success of resettlement beneficiaries, especially in terms of sustainability. Given this reality, the MET would be pivotal in the introduction of alternative farming / conservation practices through the introduction of carefully planned wildlife based resettlement schemes for resettlement beneficiaries. Inevitably, resettlement beneficiaries could benefit significantly in the introduction of land use option that include tourism and game farming which could be made possible through the MET’s wildlife breeding stock loan scheme.

k) **Regional Councils (RCs), Local Authorities, Traditional Authorities (TAs) and Communal Land Boards (CLBs)**

Both these institutions serve as the primary entry point of resettlement beneficiaries into the LRRP. Their role in the identification, profiling and selection of eligible beneficiaries for resettlement
cannot be emphasised. Using their regional apparatus, they should assist the MLR to identify eligible, willing and able beneficiaries of resettlement particularly those in communal areas and in the periphery of various town lands within their various regions. Regional profiling of potential beneficiaries could be done jointly by the RCs and the TAs.

1) Ministry of Finance (MoF),

The availability of sufficient funding to enable the smooth implementation of the LRRP is critical. The MoF being the entity responsible for fiscal and financial policies in the country ought to support the MLR in the implementation of the programme by availing the requisite funding. Further, this ministry could also play a key role in the collection of land tax and the billing and collection of rentals fees on resettlement farms.

m) National Planning Commission (NPC)

Land Reform and Resettlement is a national programme that requires coordinated planning at a higher level. Therefore coordinated planning on land reform among role players under the guidance of NPC will aid more impetus to the LRRP planning needs. In this regard, NPC should be the catalyst that ensure that the MLR is assisted to develop a comprehensive action plan on land reform that clearly encompasses performance target and indicators to enable structured / systematic Monitoring and Evaluation of progress.

n) Office of the Attorney General (AG)

Land issues are compounded with numerous legal issues and challenges thus, the Office of the Attorney General (AG) should be incorporated in the decision making and implementation structures of the LRRP in order to provide on spot legal services necessary for the smooth implementation of the programme. The provision of legal advice relating to policy formation and implementation of relevant legislation is the duty of the AG’s office.

19.1.2 Semi-Government Institutions

a) Agricultural Bank of Namibia (Agribank)

Agribank is a key role player in terms of ensuring the provision of accessible credit facilities to resettlement beneficiaries at affordable rates. Agribank could also be the ideal institution to be employed in the billing and collection of lease fees from resettled farmers as the bank already have the facilities, systems and know how to do so. This latter proposal should be investigated further for possible consideration.

b) Namibia Water Corporation (Namwater), & Namibia Power Corporation (Nampower),

Access to affordable water and power sources by resettlement farmers is critical to the success of their farming ventures. Both Nampower and Namwater should support the LRRP in the form of provision of affordable service schemes in terms of water and power to resettled farmers. Doing so would lessen the capital burden required by such farmers to successfully build their farming ventures.
19.1.3 Non-Governmental Institutions

Key or relevant non-government institutions such as the Namibia National Farmers’ Union (NNFU), the Namibia Agricultural Union (NAU) and the Namibia Emerging Commercial Farmers Union (NECFU) should be integrated in the implementation structures of the LRRP in order to ensure that government benefits from their various capacities in terms of programme management. For example they would play a role in the identification of land for acquisition as well as support to resettlement farms in terms of farm planning, training, mentorship, material input support etc.. Their involvement could be realised through the established National Land Reform Forum (NLRF) under the MLR.

20. Resource Mobilisation

The Implementation Action Plan as developed for this policy forms the basis for resource mobilisation and joint implementation of the policy by all key stakeholders. Each key stakeholder as listed in this policy should dedicated financial resources from their annual appropriations and also mobilise resources from various organs of none state actors for the fulfilment of their roles as outlined in this policy. Their strategic and annual plans must contain programmes, projects and activities that directly supports the implementation of the Revised National Resettlement Policy, 2017. All key stakeholders should form part of the membership of the institutional arrangements proposed for the implementation of this policy and should thus account accordingly with regards to the fulfilment of their roles.

21. Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanism and Reporting

This policy is proposed to run for ten years from 2018 to 2027 and it is recommended that effective monitoring of the policy be done annually in order to ensure full implementation of the policy and also allow for timely identification of bottlenecks in the implementation thereof. The implementation action plan developed for this policy should be integrated into the Annual Sectoral Execution Plans which are linked to the National Development Plan (NDP) and accordingly implementation progress should be reported on bi-annually as part of the bi-annual Sectoral Execution Plan reporting. While continuous monitoring and annual policy reviews are strongly recommended, a comprehensive evaluation is suggested every 5 years in order to present clear policy implementation results based on observed trends. This 5 year comprehensive evaluation will also serve as an opportunity for policy review in order to ensure its alignment to prevailing circumstances as well as the new national priorities.

22. Advocacy and Dissemination

There is a great need to ensure a well-coordinated approach to ensure successful policy implementation. This requires proper and clear communication channels to be put in place in order to enable various role players to receive and also disseminate information relevant to the implementation of this policy.

Furthermore, given the fact that this policy document forms the basis for guiding the activities of all role players as listed herein, it is important that all key stakeholders, including the general public are
made fully aware and timely so about the policy and its provisions and how they are expected to contribute thereto to ensure effective implementation.

In light of the above, it is important that prior to the approval of this revised policy, wider stakeholder consultations be undertaken by the implementing agency to ensure stakeholder input and buy-in. Further, an official launch of the policy is a prime requirement in order to raise awareness about its existence. This launch should be broadcast through various print and electronic media covering various vernaculars which are widely spoken countrywide in order to ensure that public awareness is created nationally, regionally and also at constituency level.

In order to ensure the availability and easy access to the physical policy document by the general public, soft and hard copies of the policy should be made available on e-service (downloadable on internet), national libraries, community and school libraries, all key stakeholder offices, Regional Council and Constituency offices, political parties’ offices, and all other relevant places or locations.

23. Implementation Action Plan

Effective implementation of this policy requires the full involvement of all key role players in executing the following resettlement improvement strategies:

a) Establish the Technical Coordination Team on Land Reform and Resettlement (TCTLRR),
b) Implement regional profiling of potential beneficiaries based on the three main categories and models of resettlement,
c) Develop and implement the suggested pre- and post-settlement support packages,
d) Develop the billing and collection system for resettlement leasehold rentals,
e) Revise the resettlement lease agreement,
f) Implement Effective monitoring and evaluation.
# Implementation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Responsible Institution</th>
<th>Collaborators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| i. Technical Coordination Team on Land Reform and Resettlement (TCTLRR) established | - TCTLRR constituted from various key institutions.  
- Stakeholder cooperation and coordination improved | NPC                     | MLR/MAWF/MoJ/LRAC       |
| ii. Eligible beneficiaries identified, profiled and data base established | - Establish regional data base of resettlement beneficiaries per resettlement category.  
- Identify and profile eligible beneficiaries per resettlement model. | MLR                     | LRAC/TAs/RCs/RRCs/CLBs    |
| iii. Proposed pre- and post-support resettlement packages investigated and implemented | - Tailored pre- and post-settlement support packages developed and provided.  
- Offer tailored agricultural extension services and training support to resettlement farmers.  
- Make sufficient budgetary provision to cater for pre- and post-settlement support.  
- Provide adequate veterinary services to resettlement beneficiaries.  
- Provide farm infrastructure (water and fencing) support.  
- Link all resettlement farmers to well established commercial farmers to act as their mentors. | MAWF                    | MLR/MoF/Agribank/LRAC    |
<p>| iv. Billing and collection system for resettlement leasehold rentals developed and implemented | - Develop the lease hold rental and billing system to ensure the collection of lease fees. | Agribank                | MLR/MoF/LRAC                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| v.  | Resettlement lease agreement revised and implemented | - Revise the resettlement lease agreement to ensure alignment with the revised policy.  
- Implement the revised lease agreement & ensure its enforcement.  
|   |   | MLR | MAWF/Agribank/LRAC |
| vi. | Effective monitoring and evaluation system established and implemented | - Develop and implement a monitoring and evaluation system to ensure the enforcement of the lease conditions.  
|   |   | NPC | MLR/MAWF/LRAC/Farmers Unions |
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