

Assessment of CBNRM Best Practices in Tanzania – Final Report

Annexes

- A. Scope of Work**
- B. List of Assessment Team Members and Contributors**
- C. List of Persons Contacted**
- D. Summary Description Presented to the SO2 Partnership Retreat, February 20, 2002, Zanzibar**
- E. Detailed Site Visit Reports / Case Study Documentation**
 - Ngarambe**
 - Jukumu (Selous)**
 - Mgori**
 - Mbomipa (Tungamalenga)**
 - Mbozi (TanzaKesho)**
 - Tanga Coastal Zone**
 - Cullman and Hurt**
 - Robanda**
 - Manyara Trustland**
 - Ololosokwan**
- F. Summary of Key Observations from Selected Sites**
- G. Bibliography – List of References and Sources of Further Information**

Annex A. Scope of Work for the CBNRM Assessment

1. Purpose and Scope

This activity has been designed as part of a broader assessment of Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM)¹ best practices that is being undertaken by USAID's Africa Bureau, Office of Sustainable Development (AFR/SD) in a number of African countries and subregions. The Tanzania component of the assessment will build on what's known about positive CBNRM experiences by rapidly assessing a sample of successful CBNRM across different NRM subsectors (e.g., forestry, marine, etc.), and sharing that information with interested stakeholders. Insights from specific, positive CBNRM experiences in Tanzania will contribute to information compiled for the broader, Africa-wide assessment by AFR/SD for the World Summit on Sustainable Development (planned for August, 2002 in South Africa).²

To ensure that the Assessment achieves its objectives and is relevant to the USAID Tanzania NRM (SO2) Program, AFR/SD and the Assessment Team will receive guidance from the SO2 Program's Community Based Conservation (CBC) Management Regime Working Group (MRWG).

2. Approach

The following points represent the approach to be taken during the Assessment:

- a) The Assessment will build on interest and momentum generated to date in assessing CBNRM experiences, capitalizing on positive lessons learned and emerging "best practices" (e.g. utilizing previously documented case studies);
- b) The Assessment will recognize that valuable insights can be gained from looking at what has worked well, and at instances where positive changes and benefits are evident; identify a few particularly promising initiatives that, for example:
 - Have generated positive environmental and/or behavioral changes, and socioeconomic benefits;

¹ That overall implementation of CBNRM (the term Community Based Conservation "CBC" is more commonly used within the USAID Tanzania NRM Program) is carried out within various NRM subsectors (e.g., agriculture, soil, water, livestock, forestry, fisheries, community development, wildlife, coastal, etc.), and may be implemented and supported by a variety of actors (e.g., private sector, individuals, government departments, NGOs/CBO, and parastatals, donors, etc.). CBNRM initiatives go by many different names, but all address the key issue of involving local and indigenous communities in managing and deriving benefits from natural resources.

² It is recommended that this CBNRM Assessment be followed up at a later date in Tanzania (in perhaps 2-3 years) with a more in-depth and comprehensive activity with the collaboration of AFR/SD and other partners using a variety of approaches, including "Stocktaking," focusing specifically on Tanzania's collective experience in operationalizing WMAs.

- Have been ongoing for at least several years and had a chance to evolve, adapt to local conditions and develop “best practices;”
 - Are representative of CBNRM as it applies to various subsectors, through a contribution to the improved management of one or more natural resources (e.g., soil, water, forests, pasture, fisheries, wildlife, etc.);
 - Are representative of varied levels and modes of development assistance partnerships (different donors, public/private partnerships, government/NGO assistance) and minimal dependence on long-term project assistance;
 - Are likely to be illustrative of “best practices,” with numerous “lessons learned;”
- c) Successful or promising CBNRM initiatives to be visited during the Assessment will be determined in consultation with the CBC MRWG, and field visits will be organized in close collaboration with SO2 partners. The CBC MRWG will also recommend any Tanzanian participation in the Assessment, in addition to other Assessment Team members (see below);
- d) Small multi-disciplinary teams (including technical specialists fielded by AID/W) will review documentation and carry out a small number of field visits, to assess the experiences and identify the “best practices” represented by the selected initiatives;
- e) To the extent feasible, community to community exchanges will be organized in connection with the field visits and presentation of findings, to increase participation in the assessment process, to gain insights from the perspectives of rural communities and to contribute to capacity-building among community-based organizations;
- f) Findings of the CBNRM Assessment would aim to provide factual and objective information about the nature and extent of changes in CBNRM practices, with focus on positive social, economic, environmental and governance related impacts, to the constraints overcome or enabling conditions established, and to the opportunities and prospects for leveraging additional widespread, positive changes;
- g) Findings will be presented and discussed during the SO2 Annual Program Retreat. The SO2 Strategic Objective Team will ensure that the Retreat is attended by a representative group of CBNRM stakeholders for the presentation and discussion of the findings of the CBNRM Assessment. AFR/SD may facilitate participation of regional resource persons in the Retreat, to help ensure consideration of information gained from the broader, Africa-wide CBNRM Assessment in the presentation and discussion of findings of the Tanzania component;
- h) Final results of the Assessment will be disseminated to enable interested CBNRM stakeholders in Tanzania to become more familiar with “best practices” and to capitalize on positive experiences gained to date in CBNRM in various subsectors in both Tanzania and across Africa.

3. General Suggested Timeframe

January 2002

- Compile Background Information; Prepare List of Potential Sites
- Review and finalize Assessment and List of Sites at CBC MRWG Meeting

February 2002

- Conduct fieldwork
- Discuss preliminary findings at SO2 Program Retreat

March 2002

- Finalize Assessment Report

For a more detailed schedule, see proposed Calendar of Events.

4. Assessment Team

The CBNRM Assessment Team will include the following:

- In-Country Coordinator(s);
- Technical Advisor / social scientist - CBNRM specialist;
- Specialists with backgrounds (combined, to the extent feasible) in Coastal resources / Fisheries, Biodiversity Conservation / Wildlife Management, Forestry, Land Use / Rural Development, Rangeland Management / Pastoralism, Agriculture / Soil and Water Conservation.

5. CBNRM Initiatives—Possible Sites for Field Visits

Due to the limited scope and time available for the Assessment, only a handful of sites can be considered for field visits. Fortunately, a large amount of up-to-date documentation on Tanzanian CBNRM experiences is already available for consultation (e.g., NRM Tracker; EPIQ), so that field work will not be required to capture most cases. The Assessment Team will rely on the advice of the CBC MRWG in selection of sites to visit. It is envisaged that each subsector group would visit 2-3 sites. Criteria for selection are included in the earlier section “Approach.” As an example, the following is a list of sites that might be given particular attention (among others), and which may be judged to fit with the suggested criteria:

- *Jukumu* CBNRM activity (Morogoro). Participatory forest/wildlife resource protection, benefit sharing north of Selous;

- *Shirikisho*. Participatory, community based integrated coastal resources management initiative, locally imposed controls on dynamite fishing, community based management of coastal fisheries;
- *Jozani Chwaka Bay Conservation Project – Zanzibar*. Communities benefiting from increased revenues and employment from tourism, forest-based enterprises supported by community organizations;
- *HIMA*. Successful Iringa soil and water conservation program;
- *HADO*. Soil conservation program in Dodoma successful in managing heavily eroded sites;
- *Tanga Coastal Zone Management Project*. One of the best examples of community based coastal resource management in East Africa;
- *Bagamoyo District*. A good example of a new district that is making good progress in coastal zone management;
- *Duru-Haitemba Community Based Forest Management*. Successful community-based effort to restore degraded woodlands, with increased local benefits. Possible model for wider scale implementation of new forest policy;
- *HASHI*. Agroforestry program in Shinyanga aimed at reclaiming areas degraded due to poor agricultural practices.

Annex B. Assessment Team Members and Contributors

Dan Moore, USAID/Tanzania and the staff of the USAID AFR/SD/ENR team (**Greg Booth**, **Mike McGahuey**, **Jon Anderson**) played a key role in developing the Scope of Work and organizing the CBNRM Assessment.

Fred Sowers, IRG consultant for the USAID funded EPIQ/AFR-SD activity, carried out the initial literature review and prepared the initial Issues Paper for the CBNRM Assessment in January, 2001. **Kara Page**, social scientist with IRG-EPIQ/AFR-SD, assisted in the planning and preliminary organization of the assessment in December, 2001; she also took the lead in information management activities related to the assessment. **B.J. Humplick**, IT / Communication specialist, assisted the team with compilation of background documentation and facilitation of entries into the NRM Tracker database (see www.nrmtracker.org).

Asukile Kajuni and **Hussein Sosovele** served as Co-Coordiators for the organization of the assessment fieldwork in January-February 2002, and were supported by **Janis Alcorn**, Technical Advisor for the Assessment, and Audax Mujuni of WWF/Tanzania. This core team was assisted by a number of specialists from USAID, including **Richard Volk**, **Robin Martino** and **Dan Evans**.

The following people participated in the fieldwork for the assessment.

Team Member	Title / Expertise	Institution	Sites Visited
Asukile Kajuni	Co-coordinator, Wildlife Management	USAID/Tanzania	TanzaKesho (Mbozi), Tungamalenga -MBOMIPA (Iringa), Hurt, Manyara Trustland
Hussein Sosovele	Co-coordinator, Economist	WWF/Tanzania	Familiar with sites from previous visits
Audax Mujuni	Policy Program Assistant	WWF/Tanzania	Mgori (Singida) and Jukumu
Janis Alcorn	Social scientist and IRG consultant	IRG-EPIQ/AFR-SD	Ngarambe (Rufiji), Mgori (Singida), TanzaKesho (Mbozi), Tungamalenga - MBOMIPA (Iringa)
Robin Martino	Biodiversity Conservation specialist	USAID/Washington	Jukumu, Robanda, Ololosokwan
Richard Volk	Integrated Coastal Management specialist	USAID/Washington	Tanga, Pangani coastal districts
Dan Evans	Agricultural economist	USAID/REDSO	Robanda, Manyara Trustland, Cullman and Hurt (Monduli), Ololosokwan

The Assessment team was also assisted in their field work by the local community members, CBNRM project staff and field support personnel of District government, Wildlife Division, Forestry and Bee-keeping Division, TANAPA, AWF, WWF.

Jon Anderson, forester with USAID's AFR/SD/ENR unit and **Bob Winterbottom**, forester/policy specialist with IRG-EPIQ/AFR-SD, assisted in the analysis of the results and in the preparation of the final report.

Annex C. List of People Contacted by the Assessment Team

1. Rufiji District, Ngarambe – eastern sector of Selous Game Reserve,

1. WWF Selous project /WD staff: C. Malima Project Executant
2. Ngarambe village meeting: ten people including chair of Village Council, Natural Resources Committee officers, game scouts, teacher, village resident

2. Singida District, Mgori Forest

1. LAMP project staff: project coordinator, forestry advisor, microfinance advisor, social science advisor, forest liaison officer, IMDA liaison officer
2. District Office: Acting DED, DFO, District Fisheries Officer
3. Ward Executive Officer
4. Village meetings:

Unyampana and Dmogongo—23 people (5 women) including members of village government, officers of Village Forest Council, village residents

Ngimu—16 people (3 women) including village leaders, VFC members

3. Mbozi District, Capacity 21—TanzaKesho program

1. Professor Kikula, Dar Es Salaam University – local Capacity 21 Coordinator
2. Ms. Malin Krook - UNDP Program Officer – Governance and Human Rights
3. Ms. Dorothy Mwanyika - Mbozi Tanza Kesho Capacity 21 Advisor
4. Mbozi District Council Core team —14 members representing all district departments

Ms. Rita Kamenya	Community Development
Ms. Patricia K. Sawala	Education
Mr. Asante Ndimbo	Agriculture
Mr. Nason Kigobanya	Agriculture/Livestock
Mr. Eliud H. Mwakibombaki	Planning
Dr. T. Rukalisha	Veterinary (Livestock)
Mr. M.I. Mushi	Forestry
Mr. Ezra A. Aluko	District Planning Officer (Chairperson)
Mr. Donald J.A. Msahni	Lands
Mr. G.N. Mwakatima	District Natural Resources Officer

Mr. Henry Mgingi
Mr. Akiba Kibona

PRA Specialist
Water Technician

5. Village meetings:

Chipaka—couldn't meet village government leaders and resorted to interviewing people at a primary school

Ukwile—22 people attended including village leaders and environment committee members

Mr. Blackiwelo Msongole	Village Chairperson
Mr. Wangson Siwale	Village Executive Officer
Mr. Ningsigwe Kibona	Member village government
Mr. Willy Sichwale	member
Mr. Alfred Gambi	member
Mr. Aston Mtawa	member
Ms. Huruma Siwale	member
Mr. Andrea Kaminyonge	member
Mr. Obadia Kibona	member
Ms. Catherine Lwabi	member
Ms. Ruth Mwamugunda	member
Mr. Daniel Mtafya	School Committee Chairperson
Ms. Grace Mbukwa	member
Ms. Sophia Mwashitete	member
Ms. Mackilina Nankonde	member
Mr. Bishop Siwale	member
Mr. Emmanuel Gambi	member
Mr. Gabriel Msokwa	member
Mr. Christopher Msokwa	member

Mbozi—6 people (others at funeral) included village leaders and Agriculture Extension Officer

Mr. J.T Shiuga	Village Chairperson
Mr. D.A. Mwenga	Village Executive Officer
Mr. Watson Sapi	member village government
Ms. H. Mwambene	member
Mr. E.T.S. Konga	Village Vet Auxiliary
Mr. A. Waya	Ward Executive Officer

4. Iringa District—MBOMIPA program

1. District Government—District Natural Resources Officer, District Forest Officer and District Game Officer
2. Ward Executive Officer

3. MBOMIPA project staff—technical advisor, project manager, social scientist
4. Village meeting—Tungamalenga—18 people including village government and Natural Resources Committee members

Mr. Juma Ganyiluka	Village Chairperson
Mr. Zakaria Ndongole	Village Executive Officer
Mr. M.E. Msuva	member village government
Mr. Daud Marazi	member
Mr. Bahati Mgafu	member
Mr. Khamis Nyove	member
Mr. John A. Samila	Commander Village Game Scouts
Mr. Makambo D. Mbarazi	Village Game Scout
Ms. Angela Samwel	Natural Resources Committee Secretary
Mr. Clarence Kidago	member
Mr. Josephat Sambaga	member
Mr. Erasmus Kidunye	member
Mr. Geremana Fumbe	member
Ms. Veronica Nzota	member
Ms. Oliva Nyangwa	member
Ms. Delfina Kidago	member
Blandina Kilyenyi	member
Mr. V. Mwaikambo	Community Development Officer

Annex D. Summary Description—Draft Working Document Presented to the SO2 Partnership Retreat, Zanzibar, February 20, 2002

Objective and Context

The Assessment of Best Practices in Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) in Tanzania aims to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of environmental conservation and natural resource management programs by identifying, analyzing, capitalizing and systematically applying lessons learned from successful CBNRM experiences. The assessment is being supported by USAID/Africa Bureau, Office of Sustainable Development (AFR/SD) and the USAID/Tanzania Mission in collaboration with its SO2 partnership, as well as USAID's central and regional offices.

The organization of the assessment was motivated by the perception that valuable insights can be gained from looking at “best practices” and “lessons learned” from CBNRM experiences in the field. These are activities that have worked well and have been successful in stimulating favorable changes in environmental conditions, increased socio-economic benefits, improved governance or otherwise contributing to positive changes in behavior and well-being at the community level. The assessment is not designed to be a comprehensive evaluation of any given project, nor is it intended to be an in-depth review of Community Based Conservation activities or other CBNRM programs in Tanzania.

The Tanzania assessment has been designed as part of a broader effort to review CBNRM experiences in six countries in West Africa (Guinea, Senegal, Mali, Burkina Faso, Niger, Chad) as well as Uganda, Madagascar, Namibia and Botswana. These assessments are generating a number of insights and knowledge about successful approaches to CBNRM that are being compiled for the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), planned for August-September 2002 in South Africa. The assessment findings will also contribute to an ongoing effort to document the “institutional memory” of 15 years of program support by AFR/SD.

Overview of the Process

In January, 2001, at the last SO2 retreat, the rationale for “stocktaking” and related assessments was outlined and discussed with the SO2 partnership. Since that time, efforts have been underway to share documentation about assessments in West Africa and elsewhere via the AFR/SD supported activities of FRAME and NRM Tracker (see www.frameweb.org and www.nrmtracker.org) and through associated outreach workshops. Over the past several months, a consultative process was organized to prepare the assessment scope of work, compile background documentation, organize the assessment team, identify sites for field visits, culminating in a review of the draft SOW and plans for the CBNRM assessment field visits by the CBC Management Regime Working Group during its last meeting in January 2002.

During the current SO2 retreat and over the next few weeks, the assessment team will review and discuss their preliminary findings with SO2 partners, and engage them in helping to identify the

key elements related to positive environmental, economic and governance outcomes of selected CBNRM activities in Tanzania. The team will then finalize their report on the field visits, highlighting the lessons learned and “conditions for success”. The partnership is also being encouraged to identify opportunities to strengthen information sharing among SO2 partners, in order to build upon this initial assessment and to foster continuing analysis and learning from lessons learned in CBNRM.

The approach taken by the assessment team has included the following steps:

- document review, including information from the CBNRM Issues Paper and NRM Tracker entries
- site visits and interviews to discern positive experiences (appreciative inquiry)
- review of field level impacts or results, and analysis of contributing factors, in three key areas:
 1. environmental / biophysical
 2. economic / social
 3. governance / institutional

Organization of the Field Work

The fieldwork for the assessment was organized to capture experiences in CBNRM across a range of natural resource management sub-sectors, including: Coastal Zone Management, Community Forestry / Biodiversity, Wildlife / Community based Tourism, Pastoral / Rangeland Management, Land Use and Community based Development.

In selecting the sites to be visited, the CBC MRWG and the team adopted the following criteria:

- Reported to have stimulated or contributed to positive outcomes related to the three target areas (environment, economic, governance) and therefore likely to be good examples or illustrations of “best practices”
- Activities with proven experience, over at least several years
- Experiences that are broadly representative of CBNRM approaches in different sub-sectors (coastal, forestry, etc.)
- Activities that have been supported by a range of donors and development assistance mechanisms; the assessment was not designed to only examine the experience of USAID-funded activities

The role of SO2 partners and USAID/Washington support teams

To the greatest extent possible, the assessment was designed to provide an opportunity for SO2 partners to review and reflect upon their own experiences with CBNRM approaches, and to learn from other CBNRM experiences in Tanzania. While prior commitments to the implementation of other planned activities has impeded the full participation of a number of SO2 partners, it was felt that the SO2 partnership retreat provides an excellent opportunity for the members of each MRWG to both enrich and validate the tentative findings of the assessment team.

Traditionally the Environment/Natural Resource Management team in the Office of Sustainable Development of the Africa Bureau (AFR/SD) has sought to fulfill a number of functions in relationship to mission programs with the view to adding value to mission programs:

- Technical backstopping to ongoing E/NR programs
- Strategic programmatic input (assistance to Mission strategy development and SO design)
- Analyzing and sharing lessons learned and environmental information (stocktaking of results and enabling conditions, formulation and assessment of changes in development hypotheses, development of tools to facilitate information management and dissemination, etc)
- Developing and providing regionally adapted analytic tools (modeling, monitoring, decision support, advocacy, etc.)
- Assessment of regional and sub-regional environmental trends
- Scoping out emerging issues (relationship between environment and conflict, etc),
- Defending and promoting Mission environmental programs during budget exercises at the regional level
- Promoting linkages between environmental programs and other initiatives (agriculture, anti-corruption, HIV/AIDS, democracy/governance, micro-enterprise development, etc.)
- Managing regional programs in non-presence countries (CARPE—Central Africa Regional Program for the Environment)
- Being the environmental conscience of the Bureau and assuring environmental compliance of all programs

This exercise relates to several of these functions. In carrying out these functions, the AFR/SD/ENR team works closely with the specialized teams of USAID's central bureau, recently reorganized to support Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade (EGAT). The Environment/Biodiversity and Coastal/Water teams of EGAT have supported the SO2 partnership since its inception, and have extended that support through their participation in the CBNRM Assessment in Tanzania.

Questions for the Retreat

As we come together in the retreat, we would like to seize the opportunity to answer the following questions related to the CBNRM assessment:

1. *What's happening* on the ground? What do you feel are the most exciting results or impacts from CBNRM experiences in Tanzania? Did the team identify the most significant successes?
2. *Why* did it happen? What are the key conditions for success, with respect to the three target areas? *How* was the most successful CBNRM program support organized and how did it work? What *lessons* have been learned from these experiences that could help us build upon and replicate or extend these successes?
3. Where do we want to go from here? What is our *vision* of what could be as we seek to promote CBNRM? How would you characterize a successful outcome to CBNRM programs that could be achieved in 5-10 years? What are the chief *issues* that remain to be addressed?
4. What additional actions are needed? What do we need to do differently? What *action propositions* can we formulate to help us get there and realize the vision?

Preliminary Findings

The attached summary descriptions were compiled from the draft reports being prepared to document the findings from the field visits. These brief descriptions are intended to highlight the major characteristics of these experiences that may offer insights into the conditions for success and lessons learned about proven “best practices” to support CBNRM initiatives, with due attention to environmental management, socio-economic and governance aspects.

Annex E. Detailed Site Visit Reports / Case Study Documentation

NGARAMBE Village—WWF community-based wildlife management activity

By Janis Alcorn, IRG/EPIQ consultant

Ngarambe is located on the edge of Selous Game Reserve, 6 km from the Reserve headquarters village housing 400 staff working in the eastern sector. Big game hunters use Selous Game Reserve during a six month hunting season. A compacted dirt road passes through Ngarambe, connecting the Reserve headquarters to the Rufiji district government center and to the ferry over the Rufiji river. Ngarambe settlement was relocated outside the reserve boundary when the reserve was established in XXX. In the 70s, during villagization, Ngarambe was moved to another location along the Rufiji river and its buildings were all demolished. After many people died from malaria in the new location, the survivors moved their village back to its earlier location. The elders know the village boundaries and rituals are held together with neighboring villages.

The population of 2,500 people includes three ethnic groups, but one group is dominant. The village territory covers 22,579 hectares, including rich agricultural flood plain and forested uplands. Village livelihoods are based on farming, including some cash crops and vegetables for sale in Selous Reserve; temporary labor in Selous Reserve; temporary labor for loggers; and sale of plaited mats to tourists and hunters. The main crops are maize, sesame, rice and peanuts. Wildlife damage crops but they receive no compensation for this damage.

The men traditionally hunted wildlife for meat, and the Reserve management viewed the village as a poacher village prior to the project. Now there is much greater trust between Selous management and Ngarambe, which is no longer viewed as a poacher village.

In 1995, GTZ began a sensitization campaign in the area to raise awareness of a program that would enable villages around the reserve to benefit from wildlife. Ngarambe accepted the GTZ program. The GTZ program provides the option of specific processes and guidelines for benefiting from wildlife in some fifty villages around the reserve. In other sectors around the reserve, DFID and African Development Bank are supporting similar activities. The experiences from these activities are being used by Wildlife Department to craft national guidelines for Wildlife Management Areas.

In 1997, WWF's Selous Eastern Sector Conservation and Management Project began assist Ngarambe and a neighboring village established by people from Ngarambe to implement this program.

WWF has provided funding, training, and technical assistance for four years. Funding includes the cost of training, and the purchase and delivery of materials for construction of community buildings and a grain mill. Villagers contributed labor and bricks. WWF expects to end its assistance to Ngarambe soon and expand to eight new villages, because the activity has become self-sustaining in Ngarambe.

Selous Reserve has also built trust by offering access to the headquarters' staff clinic and providing emergency transportation for villagers.

Biophysical

The objective is to control hunting of wildlife outside the reserve and maintain wildlife habitat. Under the GTZ-Wildlife Department program, the village is given a hunting quota by the Wildlife Department Director. The village is granted the right to hunt meat for domestic use and to sell part of its quota to "resident hunters," Tanzanians who live outside the village. In order to receive this benefit, the village must create a Natural Resources Management Committee and maintain game scouts. Scouts are authorized to carry guns and to hunt meat for sale to village members. They are also responsible for patrolling and controlling hunting by poachers; controlling problem animals; keeping peace in the village, and collecting basic field data on animals observed while on patrol. Game scouts receive formal training from the Wildlife Department in paramilitary operations, use of guns, identification of animals, hunting supervision, and presentation of evidence to police and judge. They also receive guidance from elders on traditional knowledge of local wildlife and how to hunt.

In addition, the Village must create a Land Use Zone map and designate an area for Wildlife Management and forest. In exchange for village agreement to set aside lands for these uses, the project facilitates the granting of village land titles.

As a result of the project, poaching has been reduced and wildlife numbers have increased. Although wildlife damage of crops has also increased, village members view this as an acceptable cost associated with the benefits from the project. The success in controlling hunting is based on the project creating conditions for success in governance and economics appropriate to the social, legal, and biophysical conditions and to the threats to the resource.

Governance

The village Natural Resources Committee is formed under the Village Council (local government). It includes 12 members, one of whom is chair and another of whom is responsible for managing the funds (a secretary). The Village Council chair is also a member.

The committee manages the Game Scouts, a beekeeping enterprise, and the funds generated by the activities. They also assert their responsibilities to protect their forests and are seeking district government recognition of their rights to supervise logging sanctioned by district government. They also initiate requests for changes in their hunting quota, based on information gathered by their Game Scouts. They liaise with district government and national government through the District Game Officer. Donors use them as the point of contact with the village on wildlife management matters.

The NR Council follows rules given to them by Wildlife Department. They set the prices for "resident hunters" fees based on guidance from WWF and WD. They initially worried the prices were too high (e.g., 150,000 shillings for a buffalo) but they found that hunters would pay the higher fees, because it was easy to find the animal on their land.

They set a tax on use of Ukindu grass that is used for plaiting mats. There are separate fees for domestic use and for commercial collectors. They are planning to create a rule to that sets tax on building poles.

In addition, they have instituted a local tax on loggers. By law, the logger gets a concession from district government and pays them a fee, but none of that funding reaches the village with the forest. They also made a decision to apprehend illegal loggers, although they are not empowered by law to do so. They would like to have formal recognition of their right to control loggers and ensure that they follow the national regulations for logging. Conflicts and infringements of rules not resolved by local village subunit leaders (10 families per subunit) are moved up the chain to village council and then to police. All illegal hunting is considered a criminal offense and Scouts must take the accused and their weapons to police, not to their village of origin.

The NR Committee's legitimacy is enhanced by open annual meetings where the budget is presented, together with an accounting for past years' expenses, and all village members discuss and select projects for using the village funds for the coming year. Neither the Village Council nor the District Council are as transparent in their management of funds.

The Village Natural Resources Committee also builds constituency involvement in the village by raising awareness of the benefits of wildlife as well as discussing the detrimental impacts of wildlife. In addition, their profile is enhanced by visiting groups from other villages brought by donors seeking to assist other villages to follow the example of Ngarambe.

Economics/Finance

The economic benefits from the activity provided the incentive for initiating the activity and for continuing it. In turn, the opportunity to manage funds has strengthened local governance and empowered local group decision-making.

Village Game Scouts do not receive any benefits from the Wildlife Department. The village is responsible for selecting the scouts and maintaining them. After the first year, the village decided to use some of the funds generated from wildlife to pay each scout an allowance and provide them with rations for their ten day patrol periods.

At the individual level, everyone values the opportunity for anyone to purchase meat and eat it openly. Previously all hunted meat was illegal and this limited distribution of meat to a few families. If someone needs meat but has no money, they may be lent the meat.

They reaped the benefits of establishing high fees that the market would bear, rather than underpricing and reducing their income. At the same time, they set the price for local village members at a reasonable level so the meat was always sold. They also offered an incentive of free meat to villagers who volunteered to bring the meat back to the village and help with butchering work.

They have also set taxes on harvesters of other natural resources as a way of controlling outside extractors and generating income for the village fund.

Good financial management and open communication was mentioned as very important for raising awareness of the benefits from wildlife. The accountant/secretary received bookkeeping training, and she maintains open books for the committee and the village. This is the first time the village has had money to manage and the transparency gives them ownership over managing the money in ways that benefits them.

Village funds have been used to build teachers' houses (in order to attract teachers) and renovate the school building which is in bad condition. This is greatly appreciated by all families, because the village receives no government assistance for school buildings. This is also appreciated by District Government which sees that the village is helping them to meet their national target without spending any district funding. Funds were also contributed toward an office for local government (with assistance from WWF and Selous) that includes offices for Village Council, the NR Committee and the butcher.

Village funds alone have not been sufficient to have own projects but have enabled the village to leverage donor funds for their projects. Village collects taxes for district government but the small amount that comes back to village is only sufficient to fund interaction with district government (take care of district officers who visit, travel to district to meetings, etc).

Conclusion

Generation of immediate tangible benefits (meat and public goods) and land title recognizing village lands were the key factors for success. The success generated by immediate benefits rested on transparent public decision making and management of funds. Good to have national policy that allows this benefit, but need law to ensure it. Villagers would like to see District Government be equally transparent with development funds it receives from national government, donors, and village taxes.

Remaining issues: the 25% of revenues that goes to District government is not transparently managed and no benefits return to the villages around the reserve. Villages would like to have a larger revenue to do their own projects, not enough now.

Management of Wildlife has spill over effect—are unilaterally taking charge of their forest and want rights to supervise activities of concessionaires (awarded by District) in their forest.

a) Governance

1. The following are important: security of tenure, open communication, transparency, clear roles and responsibilities, conflict resolution mechanisms, enhanced local decision-making authority, accountable enforcement of rules.
2. NR committee is viewed as legitimate and transparent.
3. Decisions about use of village funds and quotas are made without external intervention.
4. CBNRM activity addresses local priorities—meat and public benefits—school and mill.
5. CBNRM incorporates local knowledge of elders and hunters.

6. Citizens' trust of government agencies was enhanced and this contributes to better relations between WD and village.
7. By covering all NR including forest and wildlife, the NRC is more efficient.
8. Integrated with local government and clear connection with WD thru quota.
9. Imp of capacity building for government agents and committee. Training in bookkeeping and scout work was essential.
10. Participatory land use planning encourages village buy-in.
11. Cross-site visits and discussions are important for building civic alliances across landscape that in turn produce stronger communication with and between local governments/citizens.
12. Enforcement power of state encourages compliance.
13. Having guns gives enforcement power to village to confront outsider poachers of wood and wildlife.
14. Existence of national policy that lays out roles and relations between parties.... Local communities should participate in conservation and utilization of WF according to 1998 WL policy.

b) Economics

1. Benefits outweigh costs (livestock killed by animals vs. value of village fund)
2. Non-economic values (school teachers) balance costs.
3. Recognition—Receiving visitors on study tours “increases their moral to continue despite crop destruction.”
4. Market access must be good and reliable to be incentive to change—hunters know where to find their village,
5. Labor requirements are acceptable with minimum payment from village. Game Scouts enjoy their work and applying their training.
6. Equitable distribution of benefits reduces threat to resource (meat to all).
7. District Council appreciates the fact that villages are rehabilitating their schools without assistance from District, so they could use funds for other priorities. (in this case repaired District Game Officers car in recognition of fact that)
8. Additional funds and contributions from Selous Reserve and WWF may have tipped the balance for ensuring there were sufficient benefits (money from wildlife sales alone may not have been sufficient incentive for change).

9. Lack of other ways to generate funds for community public services means high value for small fund that can leverage other services—e.g., build teachers' house so can attract a teacher (with some help from WWF—roofing).

c) Biophysical

1. Immediate benefits generate quick results... meat in the pot, a bank account for village fund.
2. Location right next to Game Reserve. Sites near reserve contribute to size of animal populations in reserve as well as income to government thru healthy populations for hunters who pay high fees for hunting in game reserve.
3. Monitoring biophysical is necessary to determine if biophysical results are achieved and whether quota should be modified. Simple monitoring system best to get feedback in timely and efficient way. Quota can be modified with information provided by Villages from Game Scout monitoring.

JUKUMU Society—GTZ Selous Conservation Program wildlife management activity

Prepared by Robin Martino, USAID/Washington, Economic, Growth, Agriculture and Trade Bureau

Report details from interview with Regional Game Officer and Community Wildlife Management Officer, founder and instructor at Likuyu Seka Maganga CBC Training Center, Songea Region, JUKUMU Chairman and Appendix 1 of the EPIQ Assessment of Lessons Learned from Community Based Conservation in Tanzania.

Background—Selous Conservation Program (SCP) and JUKUMU Society local NGO

The Selous Game Reserve (SGR) is located in southeast Tanzania and covers an area of approximately 50,000 square kilometers. It is a protected area of exceptional conservation value in terms of its biological resources and ecosystem functions. SGR is characterized by open grassland, Acacia, Miombo woodlands, riverine forest and swamps. Two factors make the SGR an important protected area. The first is its sheer size making it one of the largest protected areas in Africa, and secondly it is a refuge to some of the largest elephant populations and black rhino, buffaloes, crocodile and wild dog. Seventy percent of Tanzania's elephants are in the Selous.³ The Selous is also one of the largest continuous forest areas under protection. In 1982, the SGR was designated a World Heritage Site by the United Nations. In 1996, the reserve generated revenue from visitor's fee (US\$300,000 per year) and revenue from tourist hunting (US\$3.6 million per year).⁴

³ Baldus, R. *Community Wildlife Management around the SGR*. SCP Discussion Paper No. 12, 1991.

⁴ Selous Game Reserve Statistics, 1998/99.

The major issues facing the management of SGR prior to the establishment of the SCP stem from problems of under-funding, illegal off-take of wildlife, and incompatible land use practices in the buffer zones that propagated human-wildlife conflicts. During the 1980s commercial poaching for ivory and rhino horn reached disastrous levels. Wildlife was competing with livestock for water and grazing land; and infecting livestock with diseases. Villagers suffered crop damage from wildlife such as bush pig, baboon, monkeys and elephants,⁵ making agricultural production in the buffer zones of the reserve an incompatible form of land use. Communities surrounding the SGR did not accrue any direct benefits from wildlife, if anything they were shouldering a cost through crop losses. As a result, villages served as entry points for poachers. Villagers did most of the poaching because they are knowledgeable about the distribution and behavior of animals.

In addition, the SGR management authorities were severely constrained through the lack of sufficient trained personnel, finances and equipment to effectively service their mandates.

Foremost among Tanzania's efforts at community-based conservation is the Selous Conservation Program (SCP), initiated in 1987. It is the first pilot initiative in Tanzania that targets rural people as a basis for more effective wildlife Conservation.⁶ It is called a National Project and the administration reports directly to the Directorate of Wildlife.

Selous Conservation Program is a pilot program aimed at integrating conservation of the Selous Game Reserve (SGR) by empowering local communities living on the periphery of the SGR to manage the natural resources on those lands and in particular wildlife. Initially, the SCP was aimed at three districts of Morogoro, Songea, and Tunduru regions encompassing sixteen villages, which were key routes and centers for poachers. The geographical coverage of the project has grown since its inception in 1987. Now the project supports community-based conservation initiatives in the game reserve vicinity in Songea, Tunduru, Liwale, Rufiji and Morogoro districts in the buffer zone surrounding the Reserve.

SCP is a joint pilot project between the government of Tanzania and Germany through its technical cooperation agency (GTZ). It involves several administrative authorities, and represents a rich cross-section of society and the local communities, these being government agencies, local representatives, women, men, youth, donors, NGOs, research institutions, farmers, pastoralists, beekeepers, fisher folk, and the private sector.

The overall objective of the SCP is to develop a pragmatic and lasting solution for sustainable conservation of the Selous ecosystem. The project envisages benefiting communities directly with tangible benefits (meat) and financial benefit sharing for them to become committed to protecting wildlife.

⁵ Masunzu, C. "Assessment of Crop Damage and Application of Non-lethal Deterrents for Crop Protection East of the Selous Game Reserve." In Siege, L. and Baldus, R. (eds.) *Tanzania Wildlife Discussion Paper NR. 24*. Dar Es Salaam. 1998.

⁶ Krischke, H. et al. "The Development of Community-based Conservation around the Selous Game Reserve." In Leaders-Williams, N. et al. (ed.) *Community-based Conservation in Tanzania*. IUCN Occasional Paper No. 15, 1996.

JUKUMU

In 1996, in Morogoro District, 19 villages in the Gonabis GCA, located directly north of the reserve and incorporated into one of the SGR tourist hunting blocks, joined to administer a wildlife conservation-oriented buffer zone, designating a total of 750km² as a communal wildlife management area. This common area, or Wildlife Management Area, borders Selous in the south, Mikumi National Park in the southwest and is surrounded in the west and northwest by the Uluguru Mountains. The area possesses abundant wildlife resources such as wildebeest, buffalo, impala, zebra, giraffe, warthog and waterbuck among others. The villagers have collectively created an NGO known as JUKUMU (Jumuiya ya Kuhifadhi Mazingira Ukutu), which is charged with running their buffer Zone. The organization is responsible for owning firearms, organizing meat sales and transporting the meat to the market, and signing contracts with hunters.

JUKUMU's administrative body consists of a Baraza, a Central Committee, and a Board of Trustees. The Baraza is made up of three representatives from the now 21 participating villages with a total population of 65,000 people, ten representatives from the Baraza compose the Central Committee and three representatives from the Central Committee are represented on the Board of Trustees. There are various other committees formed from members of the Baraza, charged with addressing topics such as law enforcement, conflict resolution, and education and awareness.

A District Technical Advisory Committee for villages within the Buffer Zone has also been established to facilitate District level involvement in the Program. The committee comprises the District Game, Fisheries, Forestry, Agricultural and Livestock Officers, the District Councilor, elected councilors and representatives of the Protected Areas. The DNRC is responsible for settling disputes and conflicts, developing guidelines for wildlife management and proposing or setting quotas for utilization.

The village assembly is responsible for selecting 6 village game scouts (VGS). The villages pay them small allowances (20,000 TSH/month) and provide rations. The VGS serve in voluntary capacity and are required to collaborate with the District Game scouts and with the SGR staff on anti-poaching activities, sometimes done jointly, and in preparing an inventory of wildlife species and game counts. Most of the project villages have acquired rifles.

The duties of the VGS include:

- Schedule and undertake patrol activities in the village wildlife areas at least 10 days a month;
- Report on conservation activities encountered during patrols;
- Arrest and apprehend poachers;
- Monitor game populations;
- Prepare hunting trails for hunting, camping sites, prevent encroachment and boundary demarcation;

- Supervise resident and tourist hunting e.g. Gonabis GCA;
- Conduct Problem Animal Control;
- Conduct hunting for meat for the village; and
- Carry out fire management

GTZ assisted with the construction of a fully equipped village scout station including an office and dormitory with solar power and radio communication.

Main Economic Activities

A majority of the population in the Selous ecosystem, are small-scale farmers dependent on agricultural production for their livelihood. Agriculture is based on shifting cultivation using traditional methods and technology. The area has no tradition of keeping livestock due to prevalence of tsetse fly transmitted disease however, there is a small population of Maasai pastoralists present in several of the villages. Few alternatives to farming as a livelihood strategy are available. For most households net revenue from farming is small since the remote locations of villages pose a formidable transport and marketing problem. Some of the population's protein requirements come from poultry, and, even prior to the establishment of SCP, a larger proportion from game meat.

The portion of people involved in off-farm salaried employment such as teachers, health workers or under local government is negligible. Some of the people are involved in other secondary economic activities as artisans (building or carpentry), petty traders and casual laborers.

As with most important wildlife areas in Tanzania, SGR is characterized by a high degree of seasonal movement of the large mammal species and wildlife is abundant in the areas outside the reserve boundaries. Elephants move extensively throughout the area and are a source of human-wildlife conflicts in any village where they are found, raiding crops and causing human death.

The growth of the human population in the area has led to an expansion of agricultural activities, which limits wildlife habitat. There is photographic tourism in parts of the northern sector along the Rufiji River and trophy hunting based on 'block' concessions in the other parts of the Selous ecosystem.

During 1995-98, Price Waterhouse⁷ conducted a study on the economic potential of the SGR and the buffer zone which concludes that the long term economic potential of the buffer zone is high once the villages have been empowered to be partners in safari hunting as envisaged by community wildlife management programs.

Incidents of human wildlife conflict involving crocodile have been increasing over the passed several years, in 1999-2000, 21 people were killed and 50 wounded and 56 livestock were

⁷ GTZ. *Report on the Internal Evaluation of Project PN 95.2079.2 Selous Conservation Program, Tanzania.* February, 1998.

injured or killed. In 2000 the community applied and received a license to sell crocodile skins, and were designated a quota to hunt 40 per year. Due to the difficulty of hunting crocodile only four skins were sold in 2000. The following year 16 crocodiles were killed and 14 skins were sold at US\$200 per skin.

In February 2000, JUKUMU signed a 10 year concession lease worth US\$200,000 with a tour company known as Tent with a View. The company pays the village an annual fee on top of a US\$5 per person per night fee. All safari companies are requested to contribute towards village development. Although these contributions have helped improved social services, they are not an assured source of funds and do not contribute to a sustainable CBC framework. In Morogoro, the District Council receives 25 percent of the game fees paid for the Gonabis hunting block and the villages receive 12 percent of the Districts portion. There are no provisions for villages in the SCP buffer zones to get a direct share from the hunting royalties and fees. In July 1999, JUKUMU obtained a trophy dealers license which enabled them to market game meat outside the project villages, and especially in poachers markets. Unfortunately, the community did not receive a renewed license in 2000 because they failed to show a profit from the 1999 sales. The villagers are allowed to harvest a quota of game for their own consumption.

Governance

SCP is implemented through existing government structures, and has forged strong links with development and natural resource staff in the districts within which they operate, adopting a team approach to project implementation.

Once some level of trust had been built the program facilitated the development of land use plans in cooperation with the Institute of lands. These plans designated suitable areas for wildlife management. Further, the project encouraged and supported villagers to form community wildlife management committees (CWMC) that would facilitate the management of their wildlife areas.

SCP has supported the rehabilitation or construction of wells, school buildings, dispensaries, roads, bridges and oil and grain mills. Through the project villagers have legal access to game meat for which they have a high preference. Trophy hunting is a major opportunity to earn revenue from wildlife in the buffer zone, although currently villages are not allowed to enter into arrangements with companies carrying out trophy hunting.

Although SCP has not generated large cash returns from consumptive use of the wildlife, the income from wildlife utilization constitutes the largest source of income for the villages. At present, the benefits from sale of meat or hunting revenues to communities are very limited. The villagers derive revenue from the sale of meat from their quota, however, the sale of meat does not generate considerable revenue and sometimes cannot even cover the costs for hunting, let alone fund game scouts and other social development.

The main benefits that have accrued to the communities have been through village self help development projects funded by GTZ or the hunting companies. SCP has ceased its support towards self-help projects as the hunting revenue in the villages has grown. Self-help projects are adapted to the resources abilities of the target group and based on appropriate technology.

Applicants can be the village council, a group of farmers, women, youth or individuals. If the number of applicants is small there has to be demonstrative effect or a secondary beneficial effect for the rest of the community such as the provision of basic services. Each applicant subsidizes 50 percent of the costs, usually in the form of labor, to any project in order to receive funding from SCP. In turn, SCP contributes 50 percent of the material and training costs, and the transfer of knowledge. This funding has been used for infrastructure, social and income generating projects such as construction of dispensaries, schools and rehabilitation of other social services.

In the future it is expected that villages will be able to increase their income by increasing their options to include leasing of their area to tourist trophy hunting or photographic tourism. The essential step in the formation of sustainable CBC is establishing the means for communities to benefit directly from tourist hunting. Through tourist hunting the economic value of species such as buffalo, lion, impala and wildebeest can be realized and generate an enormous amount revenues for communities. It is expected that once the legal framework has been revised to enable communities to benefit from tourist hunting, then communities can begin to enjoy the major economic benefits for responsible management of wildlife resources.

As a result of SCP, wildlife populations have improved. Elephant, lions, and hippos are now being seen close to villages. Elephant poaching in SGR had reduced elephant populations from 100,000 recorded in the 1970s to less than a third of this number. An aerial survey conducted in 1998 showed an increase of the elephants to more than 57,000.⁸ Due to improve enforcement and patrols, incidences of poaching have fallen. The protective status in buffer zones, in particular south of the reserve, has improved due to community-based wildlife management schemes. However, illegal harvest of wildlife remains still occurs in some areas. Village game scouts were reluctant to arrest relative and friends who were poachers.

Contributing factors towards success:

- WD was supportive: It granted animal quotas to hunt for meat in the proposed WMA, for villagers' consumption and for sale outside. WD also supported JUKUMU in signing a contract with the Tented Camp investor.
- Ward/Divisional administration was also supportive.

Community Society established a framework for decision-making, cost and benefit sharing and interaction with other institutions

Community Society created a trusting and transparent relationship with central and district levels of government

Community Society established clear roles and responsibilities for all players (stakeholders) society/community, local government, central government,

⁸ Baldus, R. 1994.

Village ownership—activities were selected and prioritized by the community organization

Community demonstrated a link between conservation and alleviation of poverty, and medium and long-term economic advantages of conservation

Community demonstrates the ability to resolve conflict:

- The 21 villages differ in size and population, and the size of the WMA area assigned to a village is in accordance with these two variables (size and population). In the first instance this kind of distribution brought misunderstandings among villages. At the present these misunderstandings have been settled.

The lodge/hotel is built on land belonging to only one village. In the first instance this village claimed that the accrued revenue should be for the sole village, not for JUKUMU, a conflict arose. After arbitration, everybody agreed that the accrued revenue should be for all village.

Bibliography

Baldus, R. *Community Wildlife Management around the SGR*. SCP Discussion Paper No. 12, 1991.

GTZ. *Report on the Internal Evaluation of Project PN 95.2079.2 Selous Conservation Program*, Tanzania. February, 1998.

Masunzu, C. “Assessment of Crop damage and Application of Non-lethal Deterrents for Crop Protection East of the Selous Game Reserve.” In Siege, L. & Baldus, R. (eds.): *Tanzania Wildlife Discussion Paper NR. 24*. Dar Es Salaam. 1998.

Selous Game Reserve Statistics, 1998/99.

MGORI Forest—Singida—SIDA LAMP Community-Based Forest Management Activity

By Janis Alcorn and Audax Mujuni

Mgori Forest, located in Singida District in the Great Rift Valley, covers 400 km² in the wildlife corridor to the Swaza Game Reserve in neighboring Hanang District. Mgori Forest is an open miombo woodland dominated by *Brachystegia* species. Animals include: list ground pangolin
The forest extends into neighboring districts where communities have not yet established community management regimes.

Five villages (Pohama, Ngimu, Unyamanda, Mughunga and Nduamghanga—each with approximately 250 households, in two different wards) have asserted their control over Mgori Forest in Singida District. The forest and villages are scattered in an area approximately one hour from Singida on poor roads.

Ethnic/pop figures? Crops include maize, sorghum, finger millets, sunflower, cassava, sweet potato, and beans. Beekeeping is also an important economic activity. Items harvested from the forest include: list. Important medicinal plants are traditionally harvested in ways that maintain the populations. Village lands have been surveyed and the villages are expecting titles, but they have no idea how much land they have—only that it is enough. The land area appeared to be quite extensive and include lots of woodland with small game outside the borders of Mgori Forest itself.

In 1995, these villages resisted the physical demarcation of a new national forest. The Swedish SIDA LAMP project funded external consultants to assist government to find a way to resolve the conflict. The consultants recommended creating a process to grant villages responsibilities for looking after the forest. The District Forest and District Game officers accepted the recommendation and ceased selling licenses to outsiders to harvest timber and kill animals in Mgori Forest. Initially the Director of Forestry, however, did not support the concept. When a new Director of Forestry took office and visited Mgori Forest, the villages' forest management receive his approval. Following that decision, the Director of Forestry called a meeting of all Regional Forest Officers to discuss changing forest policy to include provisions for community-based forestry. Donor involvement was central to this shift in policy.

District Forest Officer is expecting to expand the CBFM program in Singida District by 230,000 ha by adding 19 villages in two more divisions—Minyughe Forest—with SIDA assistance. Twenty two villages around Minyughe Forest received directives from DFO to establish Village Forest Reserves in 2001. Each village council was ordered to establish a committee for forest management, hold a meeting with Village Assembly to explain forest management, identify a Village Forest Reserve, make by-laws, and make a management plan and send it to District Council for approval. The DFO also sent them another directive to establish a Village Environmental Committee and bylaws. Some villages created the two committees but are unsure of the division of roles and responsibilities. As a result, eleven villages took some action ranging from selecting an area for the reserve to even forcing Sukuma households to resettle outside their forest. Only two villages have drawn up by-laws. According to a recent consultant report (Wiley 2001), there is “widespread support” for the idea of establishing Village Forest Reserves and villagers were eager for assistance from Forestry Department.

Sixteen villages in Mughunga Division, next to Mgori, have also begun conserving their forest and are requesting assistance for establishing their forest.

Biophysical

The forest is zoned in three zones. Zone one is the place where villagers can harvest firewood, day to day needs for forest produce, building poles, thatch grasses, mushrooms and vegetables. The second zone provides larger building poles and place for beehives. The third zone (most distant from residences) provides more beehives, timber and wildlife habitat.

The number of “forest offences” has radically decreased over the past five years since the forests were demarcated, and forest regeneration is evident to the eye.

Both forest and wildlife surveys were done by government in the past year, but the results have not yet been made available to the villages who are hopeful the results will provide the information needed to allow them to harvest timber and wildlife.

Village members complain of wild animal depredation on their crops and wanted assistance with elephants. Until recently, it wasn't safe to walk the road to Nginu at night due to the presence of lions. This road passes through scattered forest outside the borders of Mgori Forest.

Forest fires are controlled now.

Governance

Village forest committees (VFC) were established, Village Forest Management Plans were drawn up, with bylaws limiting forest use approved by District Council (with donor assistance) and the donor assisted each village to demarcate its part of the forest with paint and beacons. Initially there were boundary problems between villages, but over time the boundaries were accepted.

The transparency and working relationship District Council has not been particularly good.

Neighboring villages accept right /power of village to patrol its forest and collect fines according to its own bylaws (not follow neighboring villages bylaws).

Financial management is transparent, but few expenditures have been made, given the small size of their funds. Budgets are discussed in Village Assembly. Village Assembly in one village decided that half of revenue went to village government, other half to VFC for operating expenses.

Role of VFC is to protect forest, collect revenue from culprits, and control forest offtake (similar to FD). Meets once a month. Local offenders are handled by village government in accord with bylaws.

Role of Forest Dept is to provide training, technical advice, make rules about what can be harvested, and approve plans to harvest timber. Role of WD is to handle problem animals, monitor animal populations, set rules about what can be harvested, give quota to village, and establish approved process for selling quotas for hunters.

Subsistence hunting apparently continues in the forested areas around agricultural fields near residences, outside the Mgori Forest boundaries. Village Forest Management Plans allow subsistence hunting of small game such as dikdik and wild pigs that damage crops.

Surprisingly, Mgori Forest has not yet been registered (step 8) but DFO has requested information about how to formalize village rights over Mgori Forest.

Economics/finance

Economic benefits are largely subsistence—medicines, foods, house-building materials, etc plus beekeeping income. The only sources of income for the VNRC are the fines and fees charged

visitors. Villages have established bank accounts, but the accounts contain very little money. In one village, funds were used to improve the school.

Game Scouts complained that they are free labor for the forest department, but all agreed that the labor will have been worth the effort. After the village begins to benefit from expected approval for managed harvests of wildlife and timber. The Game Scouts have not received equipment that was supposed to be provided by District Council (with SIDA funding to DC)—boots, etc.

People interviewed said that they were motivated to protect the forest because they were jealous that outsiders were cutting trees and killing animals in their forest.

International and national recognition, including prizes, have provided further incentive to continue to protect the forest.

Conclusion

The establishment of Mgori Forest under Village Reserves in Singida District, wards/division, and reversal of degradation of the forest, was achieved by the following enabling conditions—threat of loss of loss of forest to a new Forest Reserve, donor investment in facilitation of process and training, donor promotion of policy shift toward some form of recognition of villager involvement in forestry, local expectations for future economic benefits from wildlife and timber, and transparent local governance related to enforcement of local bylaws.

Villagers interviewed expressed desire to learn more from other sites. They appreciated the visits from so many parts of the world, but wanted to go out to visit other places themselves. They expressed the opinion that they didn't think they were so successful and wanted to improve by learning from others experiences.

Villagers expressed concern that it was taking a long time to get their forest registered/gazetted and would like to see this happen soon. They would also like guns to balance power with poachers, proper equipment, a better road for visitors to come (increase tourism), and bicycles to reach forest more quickly.

There appears to be no effort to establish a federation to represent village interests to forestry department or District Council.

Review of the forest management plans revealed:

- Most contain an early clause that if the management plan is not respected by the village, the district will repossess the forest. There do not appear to be any clauses describing how this will be judged and the recourse of the village in case of disputes. Experience elsewhere indicates that this disempowers villages.
- The links to other land uses on village lands and the process by which it is decided that forestry is the best land use for the forest area is unclear.
- The 5 plans are very similar which could indicate a boilerplate, top down approach.

- Monitoring and mechanisms to management conflict clauses are not clear.
- Forest-led economic activity is conspicuously absent from these plans—which make them more protection plans than management plans.

The plans are very much oriented towards protection and restoration. There may be a tendency to equate stewardship with protection. Given the absence of mention of economic use and benefits, and given the disempowerment clause mentioned earlier, it appears that these plans may be a way for the forest service to push its agenda but it might not be the agenda of the village. Under these plans one gets the feeling that villagers are subsidizing the forest service (by providing guard and other services).

a) Governance

1. NR committee is viewed as legitimate and transparent.
2. Bylaws are essential.
3. CBNRM incorporates local knowledge of elders and those most knowledgeable about the forest and wildlife. So they are competent and have confidence and trust of others.
4. Imp of capacity building for government agents and committee. Training in bookkeeping and scout work was essential.
5. Enforcement power of state encourages compliance.

b) Economics

1. Expectation of future benefits outweigh costs (labor investment for protection with little financial benefit currently.)
2. Subsistence benefits are valued.
3. Labor requirements must fit into existing workload
4. Recognition and awards motivate people.
5. Love of wildlife and forest motivates some people.
6. View forest as place to learn many things
7. Concern for future generations.

c) Biophysical

1. Protection from cutting and hunting (no new permits being given out by District Council) produces visible regeneration of forest.

2. Access to extensive woodland outside the reserved forest for day to day needs provides alternative source for some forest products.

Bibliography

Mssawe, Edward. No date. *External donors and community-based management of Mgori Forest, Tanzania: What happens when the donors leave?*

TUNGAMALENGA Village—DFID MBOMIPA Community-Based Wildlife Management Activity

By Janis Alcorn and Asukile Kajuni

MBOMIPA—Matumizi Bora ya Malihai Idodi na Pawaga (Sustainable Use of Wild Resources in Idodi and Pawaga)—current purpose “to improve the livelihoods of people in the proposed Lunda-Mkwambi Wildlife Management Area (LMWMA) by establishing sustainable resource management under community authority and responsibility in Pawaga and Idodi divisions” of Iringa District. MBOMIPA is supervised by MNRT and jointly implemented by TANAPA and WD with financial and technical assistance from DFID.

Since 1998, MBOMIPA has developed pilot WMAs in 19 villages located in southern part of the LM Game Control Area (LMGCA) , an area of 4,000 km², on southeastern edge of Ruaha National Park in the Rift Valley.

It is semi-arid zone dominated by miombo woodland including Acacia, Commiphora, Combretum and Brachystegia species. The population of 40,000 people including Hehe and Bantu speaking people, some of whom were resettled outside Ruaha National Park following its creation in 1964, as well as pastoralists (Il-Parakuyu Masai, Barabaig and Sukuma).

MBOMIPA built on the Ruaha Ecosystem Wildlife Management Project (REWMP) funded by DFID and implemented in collaboration with TANAPA and WD, begun as park planning project in 1988 and added a community wildlife management project (ICDP) in 1993. Moving toward full devolution to local levels for self-sufficient management.

In addition to MBOMIPA, Tungamalenga also participates in TANAPA’s Support for Community Initiated Projects (SCIP).

Biophysical

MBOMIPA has implemented an aerial monitoring program for wildlife. A baseline survey was done by REWMP in 1994 and 1995 using Systematic Reconnaissance Flight method. Surveys were done during wet and dry seasons in 1999, 2000, and 2001. Conclusion was that wildlife populations have remained stable within expected levels of annual/seasonal fluctuations, and recommended increased offtake quota for buffalo, kudu, sable, waterbuck, and guinea fowl.

A participatory monitoring system is being tested and improved.

Governance

Village Natural Resource Committee (3 men and 4 women in Tungamalenga) is a committee of the Village Council. Both derive their legitimacy from Village Assembly's direction. VNRC has bylaws and oversees the activities of the Game Scouts. In Tungamalenga, of the seven members, there are three men and four women. After receiving initial training in good leadership and bookkeeping, the VNRC provides regular reports to the Village Assembly, and the Village Council has adopted the same approach for managing and reporting on its budget. Said that transparency makes people more willing to participate and can mobilize more manpower to do projects now. "Now village government is for us, not for leaders or any one person."

In several villages, whole VNRC have been replaced when didn't do their job properly. Village chairs have also been removed, "using group concern for valuable resources to improve governance."

Empowerment is building as people's confidence increases; see more people willing to assume new responsibilities and take leadership. One man has moved from VNRC to become part of village government, more young people and women are assuming roles in VNRC and village government.

MBOMIPA project provide petrol to the District level Cooperative Dept which is responsible for auditing village governments books. This enables the underfunded auditors to visit the MBOMIPA project villages to encourage accountable management of books.

They also reported good two way relationship with district government, and that they receive regular reports on District Council decisions via the Ward Executive Officer.

If there is a local conflict, the village government handles it. If someone complains about village government, then the Ward Executive Officer has the responsibility to help the village resolve the problem.

Until recently the bridge to the District and laterally between villages was the District Steering Committee—of which only 5 of 18 members came from the villages, and which met irregularly, only when a meeting was called by MBOMIPA Project staff. After identification of this institutional weakness by an external reviewer and after exposure to the Jukumu model for village federation, a new CBO has been created that includes representatives from all villages involved in the project. The village-based CBO can call its own meetings anytime.

Despite its weaknesses, the District Steering Committee performed a useful function at an earlier stage of the project when political clout was needed to negotiate with powerful hunters' group that opposed the shift in power toward villages when villages raised prices for hunting in the areas of the Game Control Area under their control. It was felt that a group composed only of villagers would have been unable to negotiate effectively with the powerful hunters interest group.

The new CBO also fulfills some of the procedural requirements in the guidelines (and expected regulations) for establishing Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs). The CBO has a Board of Trustees and operates according to a Constitution that lays out its processes and procedures.

Economics/finance

Value of having village-based institutions that can deal with uncertainty and change—noneconomic but valued.

Originally tried selling meat to selves, but decided would earn more money by selling to hunters. Have set high prices (250,000 per buffalo). “Now we see animals as ours, not for Ruaha National Park, or the Wildlife Department, or the world.”

Income from Hunting Block tripled from 281,000 shillings in 1996 to one million shillings in 1999 in Tungamalenga (Murphree annex D). While the levels of income might not seem high if broken down per capita, they are highly appreciated for their contribution to community projects without increasing tax burden to households, effectively releasing money for use for individuals to use for their own family-level projects and problems.

Tungamalenga is one of nine? villages in project area that benefit from sale of hunting licenses. Villages in Pawaga division do not have a hunting block, but rather receive the 25% of TANAPA revenue directed to Iringa District (passed directly to village governments by District).

With assistance from MBOMIPA project, Tungamalenga negotiated a contract with small tourist hotel, capturing more benefits from tourists visiting Ruaha NP.

Only can sell hunting rights to urban Tanzanians, not international safari hunters. If could sell to international hunters, would quadruple their income (Murphree 2000).

Conclusion

a) Governance

1. Government flexibility in guidelines to accommodate experimentation to adapt to local situation and changes. Accepting there is no quick fix or magic bullet.
2. Empowerment is essential and institutional form matters. Institutions need to adapt as situation changes and empowerment proceeds. In power relations demand external involvement, need it (as in SG initially). Providing opportunities for new roles gives room for growth in responsibilities.
3. Financial transparency is very important.
4. Open communication is important.
5. Clear roles & responsibilities, clear bylaws, conflict resolution mechanisms, enhanced local decision-making authority, accountable enforcement of rules are important..
6. Good local leadership makes a difference. Having confidence in leaders is important.
7. NR committee is elected in village assembly to choose those who are committed to purpose and have knowledge necessary to implement their responsibilities.

8. Citizens' trust of government agencies is important. Having local liaison officer helps this to happen.
9. By having one VNRC, avoid duplicate committees for every resource/sector.
10. Training and capacity building for government agents and committee. When understand roles and responsibilities, more confident in performing them.
11. Cross-site visits and discussions are important for building civic alliances across landscape that in turn produce stronger communication with and between local governments/citizens.
12. Division of villages into groups with benefits appropriate to the management regime of neighboring game reserve is important.
13. Spillover to forest control has come from experience with wildlife management.
14. Involving women is important since women harvest many resources.
15. Finding ways to turn losers into partial winners via administrative processes.

b) Economics

1. Benefits outweigh costs, be patient and remain committed and wait for economic benefits. But benefits must come fairly quickly.
2. Noneconomic benefits (group good) balance costs in some cases, especially if frees up private income by reducing taxes for village services (school construction).
3. Market access means easier to see benefits. Tourists and hunters already pass thru village en route to GCA and park.
4. Diversification of benefits matters. Addition of lodge, income from tourists' buying vegetables, beekeeping, etc. add to WL quota sale benefits.
5. Group public good - distribution of benefits reduces threat to resource by local individuals.
6. External support for training and policy advocacy.
7. Worry over environmental degradation and future generations access to wildlife, having water, etc.
8. Togetherness and sincerity.
9. Willingness to participate. Previous experience with TANAPA was positive.

c) Biophysical

1. Monitoring biophysical is necessary to determine if biophysical results are achieved.
2. Simple monitoring system best to get feedback in timely and efficient way.
3. Nearness to GCA makes it possible to benefit. Located on the road to GCA and park.

Bibliography

Ecosystem Consultants. 2001. *Game Surveys of Lunda-Mkwambi Game Controlled Area and Adjacent Areas of Ruaha National Park, Fifth Aerial Survey 9-19 April 2001*. Report No. MCR12.

———. 2001. *Participatory Monitoring of Wildlife Resources for MBOMIPA Project Villages. Data Analysis and Performance Review*. Report MCR11.

Kiwango, Eva. 1999. *Assessment of Community-Based Natural Resource Management in Tanzania*. MBOMIPA project (Iringa District) and Selous Conservation Program (Songea and Morogoro Districts)

Majamba, H.I. 2001. *The legal establishment of MBOMIPA villages' community-based organization*.

Murphree, M. 2000. *Review of GOT/DFID MBOMIPA Project*.

Walsh, M. 2000. *Key Issues for the MBOMIPA Project*.

———. 2000. *The Development of Community Wildlife Management in Tanzania. Lessons from the Ruaha Ecosystem*. Paper presented to the conference on African Wildlife Management in the New Millennium, Mweka.

———. 1998 *Notes for MBOMIPA Project Visitors*.

MBOZI Field Visit – TANZAKESHO

Adapted from Implementation Experience of Capacity 21 TANZAKESHO Program in MBOZI – Mbozi District Council (February 2002) (prepared by Asukile R Kajuni and Hussein Sosovele)

Mbozi district is located in the south-western corner of Mbeya Region, between Latitudes 8⁰ and 9⁰ 12' South of the Equator and Longitudes 32⁰ 7' 30 and 33⁰ 2' 0' East at an altitude of between 900-2750 meters above sea level.

The district is bordered to the south by Ileje district, to the east by Mbeya Rural district at the mark of Songwe River. To the north, Mbozi district extends to Lake Rukwa where it is bordered by Chunya district, whereas to the west it shares borders with Rukwa region and the Republic of Zambia.

It occupies a total area of 9679 km², which is about 967,900 ha of which, arable land is 766,640 ha (79.2%), forest reserves 93,738 ha (about 10%), settlement and other uses 78,322 ha and area covered by water 29,200 ha. It has a tropical type of climate, with two distinct rainy and dry seasons.

The population for the district in the year 2000 was projected at 493,576 people basing on 1988 census (330,282) at a growth rate of 3.4%.

Agriculture and livestock keeping are the main activities, employing about 85% of the population. Other activities include petty trade, bee keeping and fishing.

Administratively, the district is divided into 6 divisions, 26 wards, and 170 villages.

Capacity 21—Tanzakesho Program in Mbozi District Council

Capacity 21 is a new approach established by UNDP governing council in 1993 to help developing countries build their capacity to integrate the principles of agenda 21 into national development. The roots of Capacity 21 lie in agenda 21, globally agreed for achieving sustainable development as the outcome of 1992 Rio Earth Summit which hinge on the “Integration of environment and development into decision making” and “capacity building” for sustainable development.

In Mbozi District, the program advocates the use of Participatory Planning process for sustainable development and covers three divisions (**Vwawa, Igamba and Ndalambo**) out of six (50%), four wards (**Isandula, Igamba, Myunga and Nkangamo**) out of 26 (15.4%) and 29 villages out of 170 (17 %).

The geographical area is small but the participatory plans from the villages have been a milestone towards achieving sustainable development in the district. The lessons from this program have been influencing the planning process for the whole district. There is a clear sign of community change of attitude towards participation in development, the indicators for this achievements, include increased community self-help programs and activities including community creativity in solving their problems which before were thought to be the responsibility of the government.

There is a strong interdepartmental integration at the District level and community problems are harmonized by the district core team comprised of technicians and expertise from different disciplines. Implementation of community participatory plans are less costly because there is more community inputs.

Capacity 21 “Tanzakesho” program supportive objectives are:

- Strengthening the decentralization process (Tanzania) through capacity building for sustainable development at district, ward and village levels.
- Piloting on participatory implementation strategies for initiatives on sustainable use of natural resources.

- Support operationalization /implementation of Tanzania vision 2025
- Review planning framework to incorporate principles of sustainable development.
- Advocacy for sustainable development through environmental education and awareness building.

Key Issues for Realization of Overall Objectives: (Capacity 21)

- Participation
- Integration
- Information
- Transparency
- Conservation and protection of natural resources

Governance

The communities in target wards are positive to participate in the village participatory planning process after accepting new ideas to supplement their communal planning skills. The PRA tools used to enhance Community Based Action Plans have increased community awareness on management of the resources they own for development. The project proposals from the villages are consolidated into a district plan more efficiently than before. Realizing that development plans can be managed by villages themselves, the villagers participation in self - help activities has increased. This change of attitude has speeded up the implementation of different development projects. There is a strong two- way communication between the villages, the wards and the district concerning reporting and distribution of the implementation facilities. Transparency has built trust which has increased community participation in different development projects. This fact is realized on the management of micro projects funds supported by UNDP and other development partners. Supporting of development projects has been cheaper because of high contribution from the community. A total of 29 villages governments have undergone training on good governance including information management.

Biophysical

The community participation in community projects range from those dealing with education, health, sanitation, natural resources management and water to social problems associated with witchcraft and gender issues. Conservation and protection of natural environment has been practiced and local community has realized the importance of preserving natural wood through adoption of fuel efficient stoves. Utilization of village bylaws has strengthened process. Interventions in sustainable farming, animal keeping and fishing has been introduced as way to provide important alternative income generation activities that are environmentally friendly.

Economics/Finance

The district has been trying to strengthen the data base information sharing and management in order to assist PRA at the grass root level. Simple data on demography, economic and social services easily understandable by communities will provide an important input in the decision making process for the different economic choices to make. Each village has a development vision for 25 years as a guide for economic development progress. The 25 year development vision for each village will steer local community development strategy and enhance their efforts to eradicate poverty. The district is maintaining village database for planning and decision making.

Achievements

The Mbozi model has realized the following achievements:

Ownership of the program: The operational modality of the Tanzakesho program is through the existing structures, making the district authority to have a big say on it. It has therefore been learned that the no parallel structure system has the highest degree in empowering the district council and creating a sense of ownership and responsibility in managing development programs and or projects. Sustainability and capacity development are ensured in this kind of a situation.

Community empowerment: The community empowerment has increased through the TANZAKESHO program. This is despite the short time of implementation of the program. As a result of planning and visioning, communities have suddenly woken up and they are participating in the development initiatives of their villages.

Change in attitude: There is a general change in attitude and mind-set among members of the community towards village development as related to issues of health, education, water, poverty alleviation, gender relations and environment.

Intersectoral collaboration: The existence of the core team has enhanced teamwork spirit and strengthened inter-sectoral collaboration. Collaboration between Tanzakesho and other programs in the district has also been enhanced. Such programs include Village Travel and Transport program (VTTP) and Agricultural Sector Program Support and ADP(NGO). Cooperation has been pronounced more in the sharing of information and use of professional expertise.

Political support: Involvement of councilors right from the beginning of the program has enhanced acceptance and integration of program activities in the district development process. Implementation progress of program activities is discussed in the district statutory committees.

Linkage with regional and national levels: Representation of Officials from the regional and national level in the launching workshop has created a network between them and the district in as far as program issues are concerned. The Planning Natural Resources, and Local Government Officers from the Regional Secretariat do participate in the district reviews.

Study tours: The study tour to Maswa was both an eye opener and a challenge to the Mbozi district council. It facilitated the privatization of the revenue collection in the district, which has lead to increase in district revenue. The revenue collection has increased tremendously by 115%

(from 989,975 to 2,136,911 per month) let alone other advantages such as removal of running costs during the process.

Following a study tour to Lushoto district, the District Council using its own resources contracted a consultant from Lushoto district to train district TOTs on the simple and appropriate technology on fuel efficient stoves (Mkombozi Stove). Three groups comprising of 22 members in Igamba ward have been trained on the technology where by these groups will be used to disseminate this technology to other community members. 35 fuel saving stoves have been made. The stoves require only one kg. Of fuel wood per day.

Replication of Tanzakesho activities: The district council has allocated TAS 10,000,000 for PRA planning exercises in two more wards. One ward has already been covered by August 2001. The district has planned to replicate Tanzakesho's efforts in the whole district in phases.

Complementarity of efforts: The program has helped build capacity of villagers so much so that that there are now good grounds for any other program/ development actor to come in. In cognizance of community efforts, the German Development Service (DED) has supported the district with Tshs. 5.5 millions for construction of 4 classrooms, rehabilitation of 2 water sources, training of trainers for Community Based Health Workers, awareness creation meetings and provision of sports items to youths. Other activities include excavation of a natural pond and construction of spillway in Ukwile village.

Environmental awareness: Environmental awareness has increased among community members. There is also some improvements in awareness on health issues. Implementation of activities related to environmental conservation has started.

Developments not envisaged in the PSD: The program has been a catalyst for many development initiatives. Some of these initiatives have not been envisaged at the programming stage. They include:

- Introduction of fuel saving stoves
- Installation of biogas plants
- Opening of nursery schools
- Improved changes in gender relations
- Addressing health issues
- Addressing witchcraft as a development issue
- Stimulation of interest on income generation activities
- Stimulation of ward bank system

Conditions for Achievements

- Committed facilitation team (district and ward)
- Self evaluation of planning process (SWOT Analysis) conducted during Launch workshop
- Community willingness to change
- Operationalization of the program activities through local government structures
- Utilization of available resources including community knowledge and skills.
- Involvement of communities in all stages of planning process
- Political support at all levels.
- Program objectives are in line with National Development Objectives.
- Study tours
- Spirit of building on what exists

Lessons Learned

- Establishment of non- parallel structure for the program has strengthened sense of program ownership from the grass root level. The community has built more trust in sharing development activities with other stakeholders, and the projects are protected beyond the completion of donor support.
- Positive impact on knowledge dissemination to the villages as a result of different sectors and other donor integration in implementing community based participatory plans.
- Flexibility of the program support to other community felt-needs and specifically about environmental issues.
- Requirement for close follow up and patience in order for the community to understand and adopt new ideas.
- Skills are very important for effective facilitation of the communities to own the development process.
- Building on what is existing, gives the community more confidence in decision making, monitoring and evaluation of their projects.

TANGA COASTAL ZONE—IUCN and IRISH AID Integrated Coastal Management Activity

By Richard Volk

Tanga Coastal Zone Conservation and Development Program

In 1994, with funding and technical assistance from IUCN and Irish Aid, the northern coastal region of Tanzania began a process that is now recognized as one of the most successful examples of community-based natural resources management (CBNRM) in East Africa. The Tanga Coastal Zone Conservation and Development Program (TCZCDP, hereafter ‘Program’) supports collaboration between Central Government, Regional and District authorities, and the approximately 150,000 people residing in 45 villages in the Tanga Municipality, and Pangani and Muheza Districts comprising the Tanga region.

The Tanga region includes 150 km of coastline stretching from the Kenya border to Sadani Village in the southern part of Pangani District. Residents are highly dependent on coastal resources for subsistence and income earning livelihood, and of course overall quality-of-life. The region is endowed with ecologically important and diverse habitats, including coral reefs, seagrass beds, coastal forests, and mangrove forests, and supports economically important commercial and artisanal fisheries.

As a result of preliminary resource assessments conducted in the early 1990s under the auspices of IUCN, the Program undertook a collaborative process of village-level action planning and implementation to address priority resource management issues. The Program adopted a four-step approach of ‘listening,’ ‘piloting,’ ‘demonstration,’ and ‘mainstreaming’ to achieve an expansion of activities from an initial three pilot villages to today’s work in 28 of the region’s 45 villages. Principal issues addressed by the Program include overfishing, destructive fishing, mangrove deforestation, coastal erosion, poor government enforcement, and limited options for improving villager livelihoods.⁹

During Phase I (1994-1997), the Program focused on institution and capacity-building for integrated coastal management (ICM) for both district and village governments. Training, technical assistance, and funding was provided to support a collaborative process of Participatory Rapid Assessment (PRA) which resulted in enhanced awareness of socioeconomic and natural resource issues, and the beginning of a sense of Program ‘ownership’ among stakeholders. Experimentation with ‘early actions’ was also carried out during this ‘listening and piloting’ stage of Phase I.

During Phase II (1997-2000), efforts focused on the well-being of people, and were made to modify and replicate successful management actions to villages neighboring the three pilot villages. Actions were taken to develop cost-share arrangements and field-test new practices, including monitoring and enforcement in designated ‘management areas’. Considerable effort has been made to facilitate dialogue, consensus-building, and cooperation between villages in the development and legal adoption of Village By-Laws that form the basis for specific NRM-

⁹ Torell, et al., 2000.

related rules and regulations. In short, the Program worked during this ‘demonstration’ period to address management issues (e.g., fisheries management, mangrove restoration, etc.) that require inter-village collaboration and ecosystem-scale approaches.

The Program is working today on a Phase III (2001-2003) to ‘mainstream’ activities in each of five fisheries management areas extending across the entire region, while seeking to institutionalize the recurrent budgetary resources that will be needed to sustain operations beyond the period of donor support. District and Village governments are being asked to contribute more resources (cash and in-kind) to various services (e.g., monitoring and enforcement) that are seen as essential to the long-term sustainability of management efforts. The following is a discussion of some of the changes and key features related to three broad aspects of the Tanga Coastal Zone Conservation and Development Program.

Biophysical

Several notable successes in the management of biophysical resources of the region can be attributed to the Program during its first seven years of operation. Perhaps most significantly, there appears to be widespread perception among villagers that the overfishing and destructive fishing practices of the past are beginning to be brought under control. There is even some quantitative evidence of a 30 percent increase in the number of reef fish now inhabiting closed coral reef areas.¹⁰ The Program and its stakeholder communities have accomplished this with the creation of management areas that unite adjacent villages in five sub-regions under a commonly agreed set of management goals, objectives, and actions. Rules and regulations for the management areas have been developed through grassroots discussions among all interested stakeholders, and approved sequentially through Village, District, and Central Governments. All of this is quite significant, considering that 95 percent of fishing in Tanzania is conducted by artisanal fishers mainly along inshore areas of the coast.¹¹

The Tanga region was formerly known to suffer heavily from dynamite fishing, with 70 percent of coral significantly damaged and another 10 percent beyond recovery.¹² Although it will take several years (or decades in some cases) for full recovery, the fact that a decades-old fishing practice has been almost completely eliminated in a little more than two years of community-based action planning, has bolstered local enthusiasm and support for the five management areas. In addition, certain gear types and practices (e.g., seine net fishing; poison fishing) were also reported by villagers during this assessment to be eliminated or significantly curtailed.

There are now 28 out of 45 villages participating in five management areas that encompass virtually the entire coast of the region. These management areas are supported by Village By-Laws, and three of these now have further provision for closed areas within which no marine harvest is allowed. There is anecdotal evidence (villager perception) that fish stocks have increased, and that so has the health of coral reefs within the management areas. It is believed

¹⁰ Torell, et al., 2000.

¹¹ TCMP, 2001b.

¹² Torell, et al., 2000.

that recovery from coral bleaching associated with the 1998 El Nino event, was faster and more complete within the closed areas.¹³

Villagers in several communities have re-planted areas where mangroves had been destroyed by overharvest or intentional destruction (as by hotel developers wanting to open up visual access to the sea). Several thousand mangrove seedlings have been planted with reported survival rates on the order of 90-95 percent. These actions have helped to alleviate coastal erosion (e.g., Tongoni Village), and to create regional awareness of the ecological services that mangroves provide.

Working to consolidate that regional environmental awareness, the Program has involved community members in the ongoing monitoring and enforcement efforts associated with the management areas. Volunteer monitoring of basic indicators has proven helpful in maintaining village enthusiasm and support for the new rules and regulations within their management area. Villagers indicate that they gain satisfaction from being part of a regional effort to manage the environment. Monitoring is conducted on simple indicators such as number of dynamite blasts, number of mangrove seedlings planted, and the villagers have also learned how to do basic line and belt transects on coral reefs. Data on fishing effort and catch are more difficult to obtain. Continued involvement of District and Central Government will be important for sustaining key monitoring and enforcement functions.

Socioeconomic

As already mentioned, the region's general environmental awareness has increased significantly with activities of the Program. Participating villagers, members of neighboring villages, and district government staff are now more knowledgeable of basic coastal ecology and the key issues that can be dealt with through collective action. This awareness has been the impetus for at least one neighboring village to begin the action planning process on its own after seeing the progress made by other villages.¹⁴ The assessment team both observed and heard from various stakeholders of today's much higher level of overall cooperation and trust between villages and with district government officials.

The Program has focused much of its community work on increasing the number of women involved in the action planning and village-level decision-making process. The assessment team heard from several women who indicate increased income opportunities as a result of training provided to women on such activities as seaweed cultivation and organic vegetable farming. Participants of a three-day workshop in August 2000 confirmed that women have become more independent as a result of these developments, are better able to provide for their families, and have become much more integrated into village decision-making.¹⁵ Other socioeconomic outcomes reported at the same workshop include the following:

- Increased self-dependence and confidence in the ability to implement actions

¹³ Makoloweka., S. Personal communication, 2002.

¹⁴ Torell, et al., 2000.

¹⁵ Torell, et al., 2000.

- Increased capacity to influence decisions on resource use and solve coastal issues
- More equal resource ownership
- Increased village security as a result of militia training and equipment (for marine enforcement)
- Increased confidence and transparency in identifying wrong-doers among villagers.¹⁶

Although the overall fish catch has increased in the region, fisher's incomes have declined by almost 30 percent in real terms between 1996 and 2000.¹⁷ This reflects a reported 20 percent decline in the price of fish during the same period. Nevertheless, it is the perception among villagers and district officials that the overall nutritional and educational status of the region has increased in recent years. Greater fish catch is purportedly responsible for fewer malnourished people. While greater income and the fact that the seine fishery has been made illegal, which formerly employed large numbers of school age children, has resulted in more children attending school and thus a higher educational standard.¹⁸

Governance

Clearly, the Program has achieved a new level of capacity by villagers to undertake various resource management actions. Capabilities in issue identification and assessment, action planning, implementation, monitoring, and enforcement have greatly empowered local communities and expanded their involvement in natural resources management. They are learned many valuable problem identification and solving skills that can be applied to issues unrelated to NRM. Moreover, villagers generally feel that district officials consult with them more frequently and meaningfully on topics of importance to local communities, and that the foundation for a strong partnership for co-management of the resource has been built.

- Critical need for baseline information (on natural resources and human use practices) to inform bylaw process
- Community members perceived that there were serious problems—most notably declining fish stocks, beach erosion, agricultural pests
- Communities had a tradition of cooperation and collective action (Nyere's socialism)
- Local government already established with democratic principles (democracy vs. Authoritarian); level of democratic decision-making
- Community members felt empowered by greater integration into political (and economic) system

¹⁶ Torell, et al., 2000.

¹⁷ Torell, et al., 2000.

¹⁸ Torell, et al., 2000.

- Coastal activities are trying to take advantage of local government reform process which has created Village Environmental Management Committees
- Participatory development of village bylaws empowers local people to become involved in decision-making and establish greater sense of ownership over resources
- Village bylaws reflect the values and interests of local community members
- Village bylaws clarify the roles between local, district, regional, and national authorities
- Match scale, complexity, and capacity in project design; starting small (both geographically and on only 1-2 priority issues) is important for success
- It helps when villagers see themselves as part of a larger (regional) program
- Transparency in program decision-making is important, especially on key matters such as setting objectives and funding decisions
- Allow local stakeholders to set priorities (within context of environmental assessments and awareness raising), but then respect those decisions and work within the grassroots decision-making process to make incremental adjustments (if needed)
- Recognize that visual/measurable improvements will not be achieved in short-term; will require ‘scaling up’ to ecosystem-scale and take 2-3 years in many cases; human behavioral change at a large scale (e.g., eliminate dynamite fishing) will likely take just as long.
- Participatory monitoring (coral reefs, mangrove re-planting, beach erosion, dynamite blasts, etc.) should be designed to be practical and focus on easy indicators
- Some indicators (e.g., fishing effort and catch) may be highly desirable but not achievable under existing institutional/legal framework or short timeframe
- Recognize that voluntary monitoring helps sustain community interest and support
- Coral reef closures; dynamite fishing; mangrove restoration; coastal erosion
- Project size and complexity must always be considered in relation to human capacity.
- An ecosystem scale approach is essential for some but not all types of problems.
- Action planning should be issue-based with specific actions identified regarding implementation, monitoring, reporting, and adapting the plan over time
- Start small, in pilot villages carefully selected for villagers’ enthusiasm, perception of degraded resource, and good relations with government authorities
- Focus on only 1-2 issues initially with clear, achievable objectives and actions

- When ‘scaling up’, bring neighboring villages into the process at the earliest possible opportunity; they should be involved in issue identification and objective setting
- Skilled facilitation by external team is most ideal (to avoid perception of bias)
- Village action plans should be officially adopted and attain legal status
- Problem analysis stage (using PRA) is critical and a core feature; villagers must be meaningfully involved in issue identification and analysis
- Process and product of issue identification matters; build capacity and ownership throughout these steps
- Regularly scheduled self-assessment meetings (both short-term and medium-term) should be conducted at all levels (village, district, regional); cross-program visits with similar CBNRM programs elsewhere should be conducted
- It is critical to understand local stakeholders interests, conflicts, and leadership (both formal and informal); don’t focus solely on issues; get stakeholders to go beyond describing their ‘position’ on an issue, and discuss their true ‘interest’ in an issue
- Recognize that capacity-building is a multi-dimensional activity focused on (at a minimum) ‘professional skills,’ ‘ICM practice skills,’ and ‘technical skills’

Socioeconomic/Financial

- Socioeconomic and cultural homogeneity
- Degree of dependence on the resource; people must perceive/experience progress
- Allowances (for travel and meals when visiting other villages) seen an important incentive; important to not create sense of expectation and dependency on this form of funding
- Begin assessing/implementing options for financial sustainability of project components well before donor funding is terminated
- Give meaningful design/investment consideration to poverty alleviation as an essential component of CBNRM
- Provide more support for youth involvement and environmental education
- Recognition programs for environmental leadership (men, women, youth)
- For reef closure areas, have villagers identify priority sites based on ecological criteria, feasibility of restoration, and socioeconomic consequences of closure
- Combine NRM with quality-of-life, alternative livelihood, and basic needs issues for sustained effort

- Sometimes efforts don't translate directly as expected; increased fish catch did not equal increased income due to decline in the price of fish during period
- Alternative income strategies must be considered and supported (e.g., seaweed cultivation, organic farming, etc.)
- Tanga project achieved increased nutritional and educational standards for region as a whole
- Do not undertake action planning unless it is clear who will fund implementation; there is a danger of losing trust and commitment from key stakeholders
- One villager claimed that he now uses action planning to set goals/objectives and actions within his household
- Non-market values? (value of preserving resource for their children?)
- CBNRM has created demand for continued public services (e.g., patrol costs are increasingly born by District Government)

Conclusions

- Process must be genuine to the concerns of the local people
- Community perceptions of progress will influence their further behavior
- Visible or measurable improvement in the resource is thus critical
- Project should strive to establish and maintain a set of physical features (e.g., marker buoys, community signage, environmental information kiosk, etc.)
- Community members must see that there is widespread adherence to rules and fair and equitable enforcement
- Community members must believe that they are now empowered to manage their own resources

Additional Questions

- To what extent does distance from district government (and thus transportation and communication issues) affect CBNRM?
- To what extent does the existing degree of general community development affect progress (i.e., housing, services, etc.)

Bibliography

EPIQ/Tanzania. 1999. *Natural Resource Management By-Laws*. USAID/Tanzania.

- Makaramba, R.V., and O. L. Kweka. 1999. *Institutional and Policy Matrix*. Prepared for the TCMP, Dar es Salaam, October 1999.
- Makoloweka, S., and K. Shurcliff. 1997. "Coastal Management in Tanga, Tanzania: A Decentralized Community-Based Approach." In *Ocean & Coastal Management*. Vol. 37, No.3, pp. 349-357. Elsevier Science Ltd., Northern Ireland.
- Makoloweka, S. 2002. Personal communication. Director of the Tanga Coastal Zone Conservation and Development Program.
- Shumway, C.A. 1999. *Forgotten Waters: Freshwater and Marine Ecosystems in Africa; Strategies for Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development*. USAID and the New England Aquarium, United States.
- TCMP. 2001a. *Tanzania Mariculture Guidelines Source Book*. Working Document #5048 TCMP, Dar es Salaam, August 2001.
- . 2001b. *Tanzania State of the Coast 2001: People and the Environment*. TCMP Report #2000, Dar es Salaam, October 2001.
- . 2002. *Guidelines for District ICM Action Planning*. Prepared by the TCMP Core Working Group. TCMP, Dar es Salaam, 2002.
- Torell, E., J. Tobey, and T. Van Ingen. 2000. *ICM Action Planning: Lessons Learned from the Tanga Coastal Zone Conservation and Development Program*. Proceedings of a Workshop held in Tanga, Tanzania, August 21-23, 2000.
- Torell, E. 2001. *Reflection on the First Year of District Action Planning*. Prepared for the TCMP, Dar es Salaam, October 2001.

CULLMAN AND HURT COMMUNITY WILDLIFE PROJECT: A Community—Private Sector Partnership, Monduli District, Tanzania

Prepared by Daniel Evans, USAID/REDSO, Nairobi, Kenya

General Situation—ecology, population/constituency, land use/economy, threats to resources, history of activity, other major donor programs, any other important info.

Tanzania has a well established, worldwide reputation for its incredible wildlife and national parks. Tourist revenues are an important part of national and local economies. However, some predictions say that current trends in agricultural expansion and population growth will threaten Tanzania's wildlife in the future. The government realizes this emerging problem and is actively seeking ways to ensure that local populations have economic incentives to help conserve parks and wildlife.

The Cullman and Hurt Community Wildlife Project was initiated in 1990 by Joseph F. Cullman, a US businessman and private philanthropist interested in hunting and conservation, and Robin Hurt Safaris LTD, a private hunting company. The project is based in Arusha and operates in seven hunting blocks used by Robin Hurt Safaris, which are part of the larger Serengeti – Manyara ecosystem. The project is a legal entity under Tanzanian law that seeks to assist rural Tanzanian communities that live in wildlife areas, particularly hunting blocks, to receive benefits from wildlife and the natural environment in which they live. Most of the people living in or adjacent to the hunting blocks are extremely poor, subsistence agro-pastoralists with limited options for earning a cash income.

The project aims to create a sense of stewardship and direct ownership in rural communities for wildlife and other natural resources in areas around their villages that they have traditionally controlled in spite of unclear legal tenure. Its goal is to ensure that local communities, representing the 23 villages associated with Hurt Safaris' hunting blocks, benefit from tourism hunting that occurs on land they consider theirs. The project also seeks to encourage villages to promote conservation on their lands, which includes the sustainable use of the wildlife and habitat.

More specifically, the project aims are (from J.E. Clarke, 2001):

- To ensure that communities benefit from wildlife in terms of money, employment, food and community projects;
- To promote and encourage village anti-poaching programs;
- To cooperate and help the Wildlife Division in all its conservation ideas;
- To discourage illegal, unselective and wasteful use of wildlife, such as commercial meat poaching and particularly the use of snares;
- To involve local communities in the promotion of wildlife and habitat conservation through sustainable utilization of renewable resources; and
- To help local communities understand and manage wildlife in a sustainable manner and to take on responsibility for its stewardship.

The project works to achieve these aims by financing local development projects with hunting based fees, and by organizing anti-poaching patrols and educational activities in local villages. The efforts are successful because they create direct incentives for local people as well as a sense of responsibility and control.

Biophysical

The project works in three zones: Niensi, Mlele-Rungwa, and Makao-Burko. Each area is fairly hilly Acacia woodland with scattered open grasslands and sparse settlement of Maasai communities. Communities live largely from their livestock, supplemented by small scale agriculture, fishing, honey collection. Annual rainfall of only 400 to 900 mm limits agricultural

potential. Tourist hunters generally shoot lion, leopard, buffalo, hippo, zebra, and a wide variety of antelope.

Wildlife moves through the hunting blocks regularly each year, as part of a large migrational route. Since the animals are present for only a portion of each year, monitoring their populations must be done on a much larger scale than the villages are capable of organizing and maintaining. Because of the size of the overall area, and the natural fluctuations in animal numbers it is very difficult to effectively measure changes in animal populations, and thus to determine the impact of either regular hunting or any potential reduction in poaching.

Tanzania has five levels of conservation or resource use areas, ranging from totally protected national parks and conservation areas, to open areas that allow multiple uses and often contain villages. Hunting blocks are primarily located in game reserves and game controlled areas, which represent intermediate levels of use. The Wildlife Conservation Act permits no settlements in parks, conservation areas, and game reserves.

Poaching has historically been a problem in the area, due primarily to local hunters killing animals for their consumption, as well as larger scale commercial hunters. The traditional use of metal snares is particularly wasteful as many non-target animals are killed, and others go to waste. Recent Rwandan refugees have increased local poaching problems too.

Governance

Local communities decide each year how they would like the funding to be used for their village. Actual management of the funds is done by Hurt Safaris as a service to the villages, and as a way to ensure that the funds are used in an accountable way. The national government is planning to create wildlife management areas that would be completely managed by local communities. While this concept has not yet been implemented, the C & H project has laid the foundation for it to be a success in the seven hunting blocks.

Meetings in each of the 23 villages involve local Village Chairmen, Village Secretaries, as well as many of the village men and women. Ward Executive Officers, who represent the national government, often attend too.

Under recently proposed, but not yet enacted legislation, game reserves would be reclassified as wildlife management areas and be fully controlled by local institutions. However, this legislation is controversial because it would shift payment of hunting fees from the national government to local communities, depriving the national treasury of significant revenues.

Economic/Financial

Financing for the community development projects comes from a 20 per cent surcharge on all direct hunting fees for animals taken near the villages. Private donations are also sought to cover additional management fees, as well as all the anti-poaching program. These donations are often made through a non-profit organization, Game Conservancy USA, which is based in the United States and thus provides tax deductions for Americans.

Management costs are completely covered by donations, either in the form of staff time, materials, and office space from Robin Hurt Safaris, or through special donations raised to support the project. US based partners, particularly the Game Conservancy USA, help by providing tax deductions for American donations.

The amount of funds available for each village are very small on a per capita basis, but they are significant resources for many badly needed community projects. Rough \$1,500 to \$4,000 is raised for each village annually. These funds are used to purchase materials for schools, teachers' houses, and health facilities. Some livestock and water projects are also funded, depending on each village's priorities for the year. Some projects are also paid for via contracts for the delivery of specific services. Villages often provide additional labor to help with construction projects. In some cases the project co-funds construction projects with the Ministry of Education.

A variety of wildlife damage crops and threaten livestock. Villagers are not compensated for any of their losses, but the Wildlife Division does make an effort to control dangerous animals, particularly elephants, buffalo, and lions.

Conclusion

The basic rationale behind the project is that the conservation of Tanzania's wildlife and natural areas depends on:

- Communities living with wildlife must receive tangible benefits from that wildlife.
- Communities living in wildlife areas are willing to have more responsibility to conserve and manage the wildlife and natural resources in their area.

From 1991 to 2001 a total of 119 projects were funded in 23 villages. The majority of projects were for school facilities (47), water projects (28), or health dispensaries (16). In many cases these projects provided services that would generally be the responsibility of the district government

Governance

1. Government policy has recently been enacted that requires all commercial hunting companies to conduct community conservation projects and to initiate their own community based anti-poaching efforts. The Cullman & Hurt project not only began this well before they were required to, they also established an innovative fee mechanism combining a surcharge on hunting fees and private donations.
2. Communities do not have clear, legal title to their lands, which creates fears over their ability to control and protect the resources they depend on. Providing clear ownership is required to increase community ownership.

Economic

1. The project has successfully financed a wide variety of community level projects in each of the participating 23 villages, including many education related projects, such as building

schools and teachers' houses, health and water projects, as well as increased food security during time of severe drought and food shortages.

2. The project has developed reliable and sustainable revenues through surcharges on hunting.
3. The project's success depends entirely on the continues revenues generated by sport hunters, most of whom come from America, Europe, and Arabian countries.
4. Private donations and conservation grants are used to maintain anti-poaching efforts.
5. Dependence on limited donations restricts the amount of anti-poaching and educational activities that can be conducted.
6. Dependence on outside donations threatens the sustainability of the project.
7. Hurt Safaris LTD currently manages all the funds. Over time, local governance and financial management skills should be developed to increase local ownership and control.
8. Most hunting fees go directly to the Government of Tanzania, while other tourist revenues are often under the direct control of local communities. Consequently, communities don't generally support hunting or want to encourage it.

Biophysical

1. Anti-poaching activities have successfully involved local communities, and seem to have had an impact both by reducing poaching and by increasing general public awareness about conservation.
2. The overall size and complexity of the ecosystem, which entails extensive migration routes for all the wildlife, makes establishment of a reliable monitoring program extremely difficult. Thus hunting quotas are currently set somewhat arbitrarily. More systematic monitoring of game stocks and hunting off take should be established and maintained.

Key Contacts for the Project

Jay Blumer, Managing Director of Robin Hurt Safaris, Arusha

Sally Capper, Project Director of the C&H Community Wildlife Project, Arusha

Reference

Clarke, J.E. 2001. *An Evaluation of the Cullman & Hurt Community Wildlife Project*. Tanzania, unpublished report.

ROBANDA Community—Private Tour Operator Partnerships: Serengeti Ecosystem, Tanzania

Prepared by: Daniel Evans, USAID/REDSO, Nairobi, Kenya

General Situation—ecology, population/constituency, land use/economy, threats to resources, history of activity, other major donor programs, any other important info.

Overall policies of the Tanzanian government and the Tanzania National Parks support the concept that communities living adjacent to parks should share in some of the benefits of the park or protected area. However, there are no clear guidelines for community rights or established procedures for agreements between TANAPA, villages, and private tour companies. The concept of creating clearly defined Wildlife Management Areas that would be largely under the control of local communities has been proposed, but not yet developed to implement more effective community based natural resource management programs in the country.

The Robanda village borders the west side of Serengeti National Park (SNP) on two sides at the Ikoma Gate. It is located within the major Serengeti ecosystem migration route for much of the area's wildlife. The Serengeti ecosystem encompasses a very large area, which includes all of Robanda and surrounding areas. The ecosystem supports incredible amounts of wildlife that move regularly through the area. Consequently, the people have an established history interacting with wildlife in the area. When the Serengeti National Park was initially created local people were told they could no longer use areas they had traditionally relied upon for grazing, wood and other resources. This created considerable animosity toward the park service, which the creation of community based activities is now beginning to dispel.

The people of Robanda are largely agro-pastoralists who have lived in the area for many generations. The landscape is one of open rolling hills and acacia thorn woodlands. Agriculture occurs on relatively few and scattered plots, and does not dominate the landscape. Historically, the people of Robanda fought with local Maasai tribes over cattle. They also were traditional hunters, who were thus classified as poachers when the Serengeti National Park was established. Today, cattle raiding no longer occurs and the SNP physically separates the Robanda from their neighboring Maasai communities. Hunting or poaching is also now generally limited to the quotas of animals that the villagers are told they are allowed to hunt.

Biphysical

Village lands are used primarily by the local community for subsistence farming on small plots near the village, for grazing livestock, firewood collection, and for occasional hunting, either through government quotas or poaching.

While poaching was once very common within the community, there is now a general awareness that wildlife has greater value through tourism and commercial sport hunting. As a result, most people felt that poaching was no longer a major problem. In fact, there is interest in selling their subsistence hunting quotas to sport hunters to get more revenues. Poaching, often through the use of wire snares, still occurs, but much less frequently than in the past.

The area's most important feature is being part of the larger Serengeti ecosystem, which in addition to its physical proximity to the SNP, gives the village excellent opportunities to benefit from tourism.

Governance

The general governance structure of rural villages in Tanzania consists of a Village Assembly, which includes everyone in the community. From the Assembly a Village Council is elected to represent the village, particularly to the national government. Subcommittees are formed from the council for Finance and Planning, and for Natural Resource Management. The Council may also employ Village Game Scouts, who are responsible for controlling poaching on village lands.

Robanda, through its village officials, directly negotiated several agreements with tour operators to use village land. Some degree of outside facilitation from an experienced partner might help Robanda strike a better deal, as well as provide opportunities for training local officials.

The Village Council and its sub-committees currently control how the funds are allocated, so the broader village does not have full disclosure on the use of the funds. Communication with the general population is based on irregular annual meetings, so there is opportunity for improved community involvement.

Economic/Financial

While village lands have a variety of natural resources, revenues are generated from only a few uses by outsiders, including charging the SNP for sand, as well as charging tourist companies for hunting, camping, water, and general access fees. The village council is also able to generate a modest fee from local people for the use of the community grain mill.

The village currently has no direct mechanism to monitor actual visitor use of the various camps. Operators record visitation numbers, collect camp charges, and advise village officials of their revenues.

Robanda village and SENGO, a private tour company, have had a business partnership since 1993, under which Robanda provided land to SENGO to set up a campsite. Robanda then receives a fee for each camper that uses the site. Several other companies have also set up campsites under similar agreements with the community.

Conclusion

Robanda has definitely benefited from its community based natural resource management activities, primarily from the revenues it has received from tour companies using village land. The revenues have benefited the community through improved primary schools, health services, water projects, and general food security. Overall, the village is distinct from other communities in that many of the houses and shops are constructed of cement with metal roofs, rather than the more common traditional mud and dung structures with thatch roofs.

Governance

1. The Robanda Council currently manages all revenues with limited input from the broader community. Increased and more formal dialogue would increase the transparency of how funds are used, and create greater awareness within the village of the benefits associated with the area's wildlife and other natural resources.
2. Support from an outside organization could help local officials and the community at large improve their governance systems and management skills.
3. Overall, the village has been able to develop appropriate mechanisms for contracting with private tour companies and have used the revenues for the benefit of the community.

Economic

1. Being able to sell some of the villages hunting quota would be one source of additional revenues. Villagers are now more interested in maximizing their return on natural resources than consuming traditional game meat they are allowed to hunt.
2. Physical infrastructure, like bore holes and the grain mill, provide some revenue for the village, which is importance for regular maintenance.
3. Charging camping and access fees provides significant revenues that have improved the village's schools, water sources, and other infrastructure.

Biophysical

1. Robanda is fortunately located near the border of the SNP, with good access roads. This somewhat unique geographic positioning allows it to attract private tour companies, and thus to benefit from tourism.
2. A clear demarcation of the land would avoid confusion over which land is under village management, and help them patrol the area more effectively.
3. A wildlife monitoring program would be of benefit to the community, especially to track the impact of tourist hunting and poaching. However, considering the magnitude of the ecosystem and the mobility of the animals, any monitoring efforts would have to be developed with the SNP.

References

- Loibooki, Martin, and Francis Njoroge. 2000. *Annex 3: Report of the Study on Community – Private Tour Operator Partnership: Lessons from Robanda Village*. Conducted for NRI and TANAPA. Unpublished report.
- International Resources Group (IRG). 2000. "The Case of the Serengeti Regional Conservation Strategy Serengeti District, Arusha Region, Tanzania." Appendix 3 of the *EPIQ Assessment of Lessons Learned from Community Based Conservation In Tanzania*. Unpublished report.

Manyara Trustland

By A. R. Kajuni and Robin Martino

Background

From 1992 the government of Tanzania started to implement the World Bank and IMF structural adjustment programs that necessitated a lean and efficient government and a tight fiscal policy. Consequently most of the commercial ventures once managed by quasi government systems through hundreds of parastatal organizations were divested from government ownership. Under the new economic policy these parastatal organization were expected to operate in an open market scenario where market forces determine their survival and not government subsidy. Therefore by 1995 the government advertised all the 14 cattle ranches managed by the National Ranching Company (NARCO) including Manyara ranch for sale to private buyers.

Manyara ranch consists of approximately 45,000 acres and occupying a critical location in the northern portion of the Kwa Kuchinja wildlife corridor situated between Tarangire and Lake Manyara National Parks in northeast Tanzania. In 1954 the Esilalei Maasai elders gave up their rights to the land in order to benefit from improved grazing lands and additional water sources that would result from the commercial ranching operation. In the late fifties and early sixties the ranch was sold to another private owner who restricted the Maasai's use of the ranch. In 1974 upon the death of the ranch owner, the ranch was transferred to the Tanzania government. Under the government ownership, the ranch had been managed unsuccessfully as a commercial ranch.

The ranch occupies a critical location as the only open wildlife corridor between the two protected areas and the most important area providing reserve fodder and water to local Maasai pastoral communities resulted in joint expressions of concern from local communities and conservation groups. These expressions of concern were directed at the government to withdraw Manyara ranch from the market and alternative arrangements for its management be discussed. Several consultative discussions were initiated at local and national level to try to make sure that Manyara ranch was not sold to private commercial ranchers. The outcome was the creation of a Tanzania Conservation Land Trust (TCLT), the first of its kind in East Africa, which assumed management responsibility from the Government of Tanzania under a **99 year** lease from July 2000. The Trust is responsible for managing the ranch to benefit wildlife using the ranch as well as for the neighboring pastoral communities (mostly from Esilalei village—including Oltukai sub-village) during extended dry seasons or droughts.

Location

Manyara ranch hereinafter referred to as Manyara Trust Land is located in Monduli district in an area of high diversity that plays a very significant role in the conservation of the entire southern Maasai Steppes, It is located in a semi arid environment in the Rift Valley rain shadow and receives an average of between 400 – 500 mm per annum. It is located in Esilalei village (including Oltukai sub-village) and the main ethnic group in the district is the pastoral Maasai. The population of Monduli District is estimated at 141,896 growing at a rate of 3.80% per

annum. In recent years there have been some migration of other ethnic groups mostly Wa-Arusha and WaMeru into Monduli and have introduced agriculture involving cultivation. The introduction of agriculture in these marginal areas has attracted land speculators some of whom acquire very large tracks of land and sell or lease them for commercial bean farming. Such moves result in clearing of large tracts of land that become barren and unsuitable for either livestock or wildlife grazing.

Partnership Options For Resource-Use Innovations (Pori) Project

Tarangire and Lake Manyara National Parks have been receiving support from USAID Tanzania through the AWF PORI project since **1998**. AWF has provided technical assistance to the National Parks in the areas of law enforcement, fire management, infrastructure (road building, staff houses, etc.) tourist services, general management plan development, and mapping and boundary demarcation. AWF has also supported community -based conservation in the region through the establishment of village land use plans, by-law formulation and interpretation, joint conservation business ventures with the private sector, and training in CBC programs. USAID Washington has provided additional support to AWF for activities in the region, including support for the establishment of the Tanzania Land Conservation Trust. WWF has been active in wildlife research and monitoring in the National Parks, the Kwa Kuchinja corridor and other dispersal areas key to the survival of the two parks as protected areas.

AWF has assisted two local natural resource conservation NGO's Inyuat e Maa (MAA) and MBK (highlands?). MAA is comprised of Maasai pastoralists that work with communities to help them identify, determine, promote, and manage their shared interests related to natural and cultural resources through land, pastoral, wildlife, and tourism management. MAA has become a strong partner and has begun to provide assistance to the two villages (Esilalei and Oltukai) surrounding Manyara ranch.

Biophysical

The Manyara ranch lands function as a critical wildlife migration corridor and dispersal area. The once abundant corridors linking Tarangire and Manyara National Parks have been substantially reduced due to scattered rural settlements, commercial and subsistence farming. Only three key wildlife movement corridors still remain, one of which is Kwa Kuchinja corridor that makes up Manyara Trust Lands.

The ranch faced numerous threats due to poor management under government control such as, illegal tree felling for charcoal production and construction, illegal grazing, wildlife poaching, and the illegal sale of commercial cattle breeding stock and ranch assets. The trust via the steering committee is taking immediate actions to control illegal activities on the land. These actions include setting up the management team and working closely with village leaders to develop an interim pastoral grazing plan that will allow an appropriate level of grazing prior to the development of a more comprehensive pastoral grazing management plan.

Governance

TLCT constitution outlines the roles of a Board of Trustees and a community steering committee. The Board has been established and is comprised of the following members:

Community representative from Esilalei village
The LAIBON – a traditional Maasai leader/traditional healer
The local Member of Parliament
The Director of Wildlife
The Director General of TANAPA
Representative GEF/UNDP Cross Border Biodiversity Project rep.
Representative from WWF
Representative from AWF
Representative from the business community
Representative from a local conservation consultancy

The steering committee serves as an advisory body made up of community members elected by their respective village assemblies. The role of the steering committee is to:

- Advise the Trustees on management of land and immovable property acquired by the TLCT
- Provide liaison between the Trustees, surrounding local communities and other stakeholders
- Discuss and resolve issues that arise, such as land use, business ventures and other activities that are compatible with the management plan.

Training and strengthening plans for the steering committee include:

- Exchange visits to the other communities (e.g. Ololosokwan)
- Study tours to African countries and eventually to the US
- On site workshops and seminars
- Visits by other groups and interactions and exchange of experiences
- Management training at local institutions

Economic

The land management decisions the Trust decides to take will determine the potential for gains. There are several ways in which the operation of Manyara Trust Lands could provide benefits to the local communities, some of which are economic and others which are in non-economic ways. Access for neighboring communities to the water supplies provided through dams, bore holes and water tanks as well as grazing areas will be important to maintain support and good relationships. Options that include wildlife related and/or cultural tourism have a high likelihood of being profitable due to the Ranch's location on route to several of the country's best know National Parks. The Ranch has the opportunity to be more flexible than the neighboring protected areas in the range of services it can offer such as night drives, walking safaris, etc. Relationships with the private sector can benefit the communities economically in a variety of ways.

The inclusion of local community support is essential to the success of the Manyara Trust Land concept of preserving wildlife corridors and dispersal areas. Local communities will have to realize tangible benefits from the Trust Lands if the concept is to be successful. Creative strategies for community benefit sharing along with the perpetuation of sustainable levels of traditional pastoral grazing will ensure a level of trust necessary to secure a long term commitment to conservation while preserving a traditional way of life for local people. The Manyara Trust Lands location in a semi arid environment characterized by low rainfall precludes any profitable agricultural undertakings. The area is suited for livestock production and wildlife management. Many of the protected areas in East Africa are situated in these environments. The trust concept therefore provides the only rational use of the ranch.

Annex F. Summary of key observations from selected CBNRM sites

Site/Activity	Community	Area (ha)	Powers devolved	Economic Benefits	Other Key results	Best
Tanga Coastal Zone Management	45 villages	Several districts	Empowered village environmental management committees to draft bylaws in support of community led action planning, monitoring and enforcement	Increased nutritional and education standards; increased fish catch; expansion of alternative income generating enterprises	Improved protection of fisheries; curtailed dynamite fishing, poisoning; replanting of mangroves; reduced shoreline erosion	PRA and t self-a meet equit dema mark
Ngarambe Community based wildlife management	2,500 villagers	22,579	Policing, hunting, enforcement	Meat harvest, infrastructure development	Poaching reduced, wildlife populations stabilized, relations improved with gov't agents	Villag Com villag book accor distri partici NRM
Jukumu	65,000 in 19 villages	75,000	Acquired permits to hunt; revenue sharing agreement	Game harvest; lease revenues	Improved relations with gov't	Used consc decis
Mgori Forest	5 villages or about 1250 households	40,000	Patrol forest, fine poachers, draft and enforce bylaws	Small Community Fund; increased access to forest for subsistence needs; anticipate approval for harvesting of wildlife and timber	Gov't ceased issuing permits to outsiders for hunting and timber cutting; poaching reduced; fires stopped; forest regenerated	Forese villag legiti dispu mark keep provi assist
Mbomipa (wildlife and forest management)	40,000 farmers and pastoralists	400,000	Patrolling, quotas for game harvest, draft bylaws, set fines and licences	Funds used for local development projects; diversification of sources of incomes and benefits (lodges, wildlife, beekeeping, food sales to tourists)	Poaching reduced, wildlife stabilized, increased off-take of wildlife for local community; increased trust in gov't agencies	Cross wom educ good comm book accor use p offic gov't singl
TanzaKesho (integrated)	Mbozi		Problem assessment,	Increased access to technical advice	Schools renovated, springs protected,	Inten energ

Site/Activity	Community	Area (ha)	Powers devolved	Economic Benefits	Other Key results	Best
rural development)	district		planning and implementation of local level development	from district extension workers in support of sustainable income-generating activities	forests protected, fuel efficient stoves, improved ag/livestock practices, improved community welfare, increased self-reliance	keep respo distri comm coor appro
Cullman and Hurt	23 villages		Decisions about use of revenues from hunting	Funding of small community development projects, local facilities, water projects, drought relief	Reduced poaching, increased public awareness about conservation	Use o to ge comm privat mana decis labor
Robanda	Hunters and pastoralists		Villagers negotiate agreements with tour operators; village decides on use of revenues	Improved schools, health services, water projects, food security, housing	Poaching has declined	Can natio ventu comp supp gove plann
Manyara Trustland		45,000	Creation of land trust, joint management of a ranch; community control over access to and use of ranch land	Seasonal access to water, pasture reserve; renovation of school facilities, increased opportunity for community benefit from wildlife based tourism	2Increased collaboration between community and gov't authorities	Use S awar gove of the game

Annex G. Bibliography

- African Wildlife Foundation (AWF). Undated. African Heartland.
- Beltran, J. (Ed.) 2000. Indigenous and Traditional Peoples and Protected Areas. Principles, Guidelines and Case Studies. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK and WWF International, Gland, Switzerland. xi + 133pp. ISBN 2-8317-0547-9
- Boshe, J.I. 1989. "Kwakuchinja Wildlife Corridor." *Kakakuona* 1(1): 18-19
- Ecosystem Ltd. 1980. *Livestock, wildlife and land use survey in the Arusha Region, Tanzania*. Ecosystem Ltd., Nairobi
- EPIQ. 2000. *Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA) for Road Improvements in Tanzania's National Parks*.
- Gamassa, D.M. 1998. *Stakeholder Analysis for the conservation and Management of Critical Wildlife Corridors in Northern Tanzania*. Technical Report to UNDP.
- Hassan, S.N. 2000. "Conservation Status of the Kwa Kuchinja Wildlife Corridor in the Last Two Decades." *Kakakuona* 16: 12 –15.
- Hilton-Taylor, C. comp. 2000. *2000 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*. Gland: IUCN.
- IUCN (World Conservation Union). 1996. *1996 IUCN Red List of Threatened Animals*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.
- Kajuni, A.R., and K.L.I. Campbell. 1988. *Land uses conflict in the Tarangire – Simanjiro Area*. A Report to the Board of Trustees of TANAPA. (Mimeo pp. 8).
- Kajuni, A.R. 2000. *Manyara Ranch Interim Operation Plan*. The Tanzania Land Conservation Trust African Wildlife Foundation, Arusha, Tanzania .
- . 2000. *Kwa Kuchinja- Mbugwe Mweka Project Area Concepts & Rationale For Developing a General Management Plan*. College of African Wildlife Management, Mweka
- . 2000. *Conflicting User interest in the Usangu Wetlands and their Impact on its Management – an Overview*. JET.
- Kapela, E.B., and S.R. Moe. 1988. *Conflicts between conservation interests and the local people. The case of Lake Burungi in Northern Tanzania*. MSc. Thesis, Agricultural University of Norway.
- Kates, J., and A. Moulton. 2001. *Tarangire National Park: Visitor's Survey Results*. Unpublished Report. African Wildlife Foundation.- PORI project. Arusha
- Kidegesho, J.R. 2000. "Participatory land use planning for Kwakuchinja Wildlife corridor." *Kakakuona* 19: 8–14.

- Kidegesho, J.R., Shombe-Hassan, N. and Porokwa, J. 2000. "Can Tarangire Survive?" *Kakakuona* 18: 10–17.
- Kurji, F. 1997. "Population Growth and Redistribution in and around Tarangire Ecosystem, Tanzania." In *Tarangire Conservation Project (1998)*. Analysis of migratory movements of large mammals and their interaction with human activities in the Tarangire area, Tanzania, as a contribution to a conservation and sustainable development strategy. Final Report. University of Milan, Italy 1–12.
- Lufungulo, E.T. 1999. *Wildlife Conservation and Agriculture in the Tarangire-Lake Manyara Ecosystem: Conflicts and Proposals for Resolution*. MSc Thesis. University of Aberdeen. Scotland. UK
- Mwalyosi, R.B.B. 1991. "Ecological evaluation for wildlife corridors and buffer zones for Lake Manyara National Park, Tanzania and its immediate environment." *Biological Conservation*, 57: 171–186.
- Mwalyosi, R.R.B. 1991. "Population Growth, Carrying Capacity and Sustainable Development in South-West Maasailand." *Journal of Environmental Management* 33: 175-187.
- Myonga, N.A. 2000. *The Importance of Kwakuchinja Wildlife Corridor to Tarangire and Lake Manyara National Parks, Arusha, Tanzania*. MSc, Thesis. University of Kent at Canterbury. UK.
- Newmark, W.D. 1996. "Insularization of Tanzanian parks and local extinction of large mammals." *Conservation Biology* 10: 1549–56.
- Otto, J., B. Kamara, and A. Lissu. 1998, *Closing Corridors: Impacts of Policy, Privatization and Practice on Wildlife Movements in the Tarangire-Lake Manyara areas*. EPIQ, Tanzania
- Pratt, D.J., and Gwynne M.D. 1977. *Rangeland Management and Ecology in East Africa*. Hodder and Stoughton. London.
- Prins, H.H.T. 1987. "Nature conservation as an integral part of optimal land use in East Africa: the case of the Maasai Ecosystem of Northern Tanzania." *Biological Conservation*, 40: 141–161.
- Savory, A., and J. Butterfield. 1999. *Holistic management: a new framework for decision making. Second edition*. Island Press: Washington, DC.
- Silkilwasha, F. 1998. *Biodiversity Conservation in Lake Manyara Biosphere Reserve: A paper presented at the 4th BRAAF Workshop: 30th March – 2nd April 1998: Arusha, Tanzania*.
- Tanzania Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. 1998. *The Wildlife Policy of Tanzania*. Government Printer. Dar es Salaam.
- Tanzania National Parks. 2002. Tarangire National Park (Draft) General Management Plan/ Environmental Impact Assessment. Arusha.

- . 2000. *Tarangire National Park Bird Check List*.
- . 1999. *TANAPA Quick Reference Statistics*. Mimeo 23 p.
- . 1994. *Tarangire National Park Management Zone Plan/Environmental Impact Assessment*. Arusha.
- . 1994. *National Policies for National Parks in Tanzania*.
- Tanzania Wildlife Conservation Monitoring (TWCM). 1999. *Aerial Census in the Tarangire Ecosystem, Dry Season*.
- Tarangire Conservation Project (TCP). 1998. *Analysis of migratory movements of large mammals and their interaction with human activities in the Tarangire area, Tanzania, as a contribution to a conservation and sustainable development strategy*. Final Report. University of Milan, Italy 1 –122.
- Van de Vijer, C. 1999. *Fire and Life in Tarangire*. PhD Dissertation University of Wageningen, The Netherlands.
- World Resources Institute. 1994. *World Resources Report 1994–95—A Guide to the Global Environment: People and the environment*.
- Young, E.B., and A.R. Kajuni. 2000. *Management Zone Concept Plan. Manyara Trust Lands*. Tanzania Land Conservation Trust. African Wildlife Foundation. Arusha