

IRINGA SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION PROJECT
IRINGA DISTRICT, TANZANIA
HIMA (IRINGA)/DANIDA

HIMA IRINGA IMPACT STUDY

SOCIO-ECONOMIC REPORT

By

Dr. N. Mdoe, SUA
Dr. Z. Mvena, SUA

SEPTEMBER, 1995

I/1./cons./95/1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The HIMA impact study covers three target villages and one non-target village from each of the two target divisions, namely Kilolo and Mazombe. Information sources were mainly from HIMA documents, interviews with 11 HIMA staff, 6 extension workers, 14 village officials (including Mazingira Committee officials), and from 152 farmers. The major limitations of the study include; inadequate time and hence a small sample, wrong timing coinciding with peak labour demand and hence not easy to get the farmers, and the fact that some HIMA staff were away in Mbeya and later in Idete and hence were not available at the time the team members were scheduled to talk to them.

In capacity and institutional building, HIMA has addressed one of the major weaknesses of most government employees by providing an appropriate working environment and equipping them with both communication skills and facilities as well as technical skills through the various HIMA sponsored seminars, workshops, short courses and study tours.

HIMA has furnished infrastructural support e.g. construction or rehabilitation of buildings, provision of transport facilities at all levels, computers, photocopiers etc. On support of institutions, the District Council, District Community Development Office, District Agricultural and Livestock Development Office, and District Natural Resources Office have all benefitted from HIMA in many ways. In addition village institutions such as schools, churches, various groups and the village government have also benefitted from HIMA support. Government institutions such as Uyoile Agricultural Research and Training Centre, SUA, TRDC, Rungemba, Tengeru and IDM have in one way or another working together with HIMA by providing researchers, consultants and trainers.

To sustain HIMA activities, appropriate training of local staff and farmers has been undertaken through seminars, workshops, study tours, short and long courses, etc. Quantity of training is reflected on the total number of beneficiaries trained while the quality of training, on the other hand, is reflected by competence and the adoption rates and the quality of adoption or ability to follow recommendations as discussed under the relevant sections.

On soil and water conservation, farmers appear to be quite aware on the need to conserve both the soil and water. On soil conservation farmers have adopted more conservation works that require least labour demand hence trashlines, grasslines, "fanya juu/chini" in that order. On protection of catchments, farmers are aware and appreciative of the results of their efforts. Limitations on soil conservation include where land is rented and hence no incentive to invest, lack of technical know how, and the claim that their farms are on flat land or these "shambas" are too small.

On forestry, there has been a shift of emphasis from central nurseries to village-based nurseries e.g. being managed by

village or sub-village governments, schools, groups, religious institutions and individuals. Thus while in 1989/90 most seedlings came from village-based nurseries, there has been an increase in the diversity of tree species. Both the shift to village based nurseries and increase in diversity is a necessary condition for the sustainability of forestry activities. Farmers appear to have a bias towards commercial timber. The other limitation is that of poor tree seedling survival rates of 50 percent and below in some villages due to drought or late planting as this activity competes with agricultural activities for labour at this time of the year. In non-target villages, the lack of seedlings is the main limitation.

Most popular tree species are pines for Kilolo division and grevillea for Mazombe division. Eucalyptus are popular in both divisions but planted to a lesser degree partly due to what is reported to be the "eucalyptus problem. Woodlots are predominant in Kilolo and managed by firebreaks more than weeding while boundary planting is common in Mazombe division. In both divisions planting is done mostly through the use of family labour.

Pruning especially of pines has been done once for "HIMA trees" and the prunings are used as fuelwood except for those with distant woodlots. Generally the poor harvest fuelwood or timber earlier than the wealthier farmers. Otherwise the whole household benefits from woodlots in form of fuelwood and cash. Again, tree planting is constrained in some areas due to lack of adequate or rented land and for the non-target villages, the lack of seedlings. Wealthier farmers have established larger woodlots than the relatively poorer farmers.

On improved granaries, 83 percent of the interviewed farmers in the target villages are aware of them but only 4 percent have adopted them. Reasons given for this poor adoption include; expenses involved, unstable if they have to be large enough to accommodate enough food for large families, no adequate food reserves and the lack of time to construct them.

On rodent control, traditional methods that are in use include use of clearing bushes, rat poison from plants and traps bought from shops or during market days. Only 34 percent of the respondents report using the HIMA supplied rat traps because some farmers say they are no better than other traps, feel disgusted to dispose off the many dead rats from inside the trap, and the lack of local artisans ("fundis") to mass produce the HIMA traps.

Rodenticides are very popular amongst farmers because they say they are very effective in killing rats. Wealthier farmers receive more rodenticides than poorer farmers as they are able to contribute more maize for that purpose. The limitations of using HIMA supplied rodenticides which are raised by a tiny minority of the respondents include the lack of joint efforts to poison the rats hence rats from neighbours will keep coming and being afraid of poisoning some people and livestock as there are still a few people who eat them. Our only concern on rodenticides is on the issue of sustainability since HIMA has already decided to stop supplying it.

Drought resistant and early maturing crops have been made available in only Mazombe division. Maize, sunflower, groundnuts, sorghum, cassava and cowpeas have been distributed to farmers in Kipaduka, Uhambingeto and Vitono village. Adoption is low partly due to the fact that this intervention only in 1993/94 and only in three villages.

The adoption of agroforestry practices is very low, adopted by only about 16 percent of the interviewed farmers in the target village. For those who report as having adopted, no regard is taken on proper spacing, pattern of planting and management regime. The limitations here appear to be lack of adequate training and appropriate tree seeds.

For by-laws, villages have received training on formulation of by-laws including through the study tour to Soil Conservation and Agroforestry Project (SCAPA) in Arusha and Land Use Management Project (LAMP) in Babati. The most respected by-law in both divisions is fire control followed by protection of catchments and hilltops. The by-law on controlled grazing is better known and more applicable in Mazombe division than in Kilolo due to presence of more livestock in the former.

Enforcement of by-laws appear to be mainly through fines or imprisonment and the use of permits. Effectiveness of these by-laws is reflected in the fact that there have been a decline of fire incidences in the target villages over the years as reported in the July - December, 1994 HIMA Project Progress Report and Information from the sample farmers.

Finally, HIMA has reduced the women's workload through the use of women's Mazingira Fund e.g. Kising'a maize mill, establishment of woodlots for fuelwood, introduction of donkeys as beasts of burden, gender sensitization and assistance in establishing day care centres and dispensaries.

HIMA therefore has gone beyond the creation of awareness which was the key objective in phase 1. We have seen physical impacts too especially in tree planting.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
ABBREVIATIONS	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 THE STUDY	2
1.3 METHODOLOGY	2
1.3.1 Study of documents	2
1.3.2 Field Work	2
1.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	4
1.5 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	5
2: CAPACITY BUILDING	6
2.1 OVERVIEW	6
2.2 INFRASTRUCTURAL SUPPORT	6
2.3 INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT	6
2.3 TRAINING	7
2.3.1 District level training	8
2.3.2 Village level training	8
3: ADOPTION OF HIMA INTERVENTIONS	20
3.1 SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION MEASURES	20
3.2 TREE PLANTING	21
3.3 RODENT CONTROL	26
3.4 DROUGHT RESISTANT CROPS	29
3.5 AGROFORESTRY PRACTICES	30
4. BY-LAWS	32
4.1 AWARENESS ON BY-LAWS	32
4.2 THE FORMULATION OF BY-LAWS	34
4.3 ENFORCING THE BY-LAWS	34
4.4 EFFECTIVENESS OF BY-LAWS	35
5. WOMENS' WORKLOAD	36
5.1 HIMA AND THE WOMEN'S WORKLOAD	36
5.2 REDUCTION OF THE WORKLOAD	36
6: ECONOMIC IMPACT OF HIMA INTERVENTIONS	38
7: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	39
7.1 CONCLUSIONS	39
7.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	39
APPENDICES	41
Appendix 1	41
Appendix 2	43
Appendix 3	44
Appendix 4	46
Appendix 5	48