

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Danida

**MEMA, Natural Woodland
Management Project and
Udzungwa Mountains Forest
Management Project**

Beneficiary Assessment, Final Report

June 2002

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Danida
MEMA, Natural Woodland
Management Project and
Udzungwa Mountains Forest
Management Project
Beneficiary Assessment

June 2002

Report no. 010
Issue no. 002
Date of issue 28 June, 2002

Prepared sdr, sdr, Ms. N. K. Palangyo, Mr. F. P. Maganga
Checked sdr
Approved sdr

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Executive Summary	4
2.1	Main Findings	4
2.2	Recommendations	8
3	Approach and Method	9
3.1	Beneficiary Assessment - Presentation of Approach	9
3.2	Beneficiary Assessment of the MEMA project- Method used	11
4	Main Findings and Situational Analysis	14
4.1	Project Activities and Processes at Management and District Institutional Levels	14
4.2	Community Management Level, VNRC and VC	25
4.3	User Level - Village and Sub-Village	38
5	Recommendations	39
5.1	Recommendations for Immediate Action and Adjustments	39
5.2	Recommendations for Continuation of Activities	39
Box Text 1	A discussion of important issues with a district management level beneficiary	18
Box Text 2	Participation, forest management and PFM planning in Lulanzi community	30
Box Text 3	A Maasai family in Mfyome community	35
Box Text 4	Interview with village carpenters in Migoli	37
Appendix 1	TOR	
Appendix 2	District Beneficiaries Interviewed	

1 Introduction

In 1992, the Royal Danish Embassy (RDE) initiated support for the Udzungwa Mountains Forest Management Project by fielding a project preparation mission. In September 1997 the Regional Commissioner's office, assisted by HIMA, submitted a request for a revised and updated project, which in March 1998 resulted in Danida fielding a Project Identification Mission concerning the future EDRF programme to Tanzania. The mission recommended Danida to embark on a number of forestry related activities in Iringa Region, including activities on management of the Udzungwa Mountains forests and the woodlands in Iringa District. In June 1999 implementation of Danida supported forestry and biodiversity projects began in Iringa District with the two jointly managed projects under the name MEMA¹:

1. Udzungwa Mountains Forest Management and Biodiversity Conservation Project (UMFM)
2. Community Based Natural Woodlands Management Project (NWMP)

One of the main objectives of the project is to work with Forestry and Bee-keeping Division of the Natural Resource Department to develop Joint Forest Management/Community-Based Forest Management in five forest areas in the Iringa District. Two of these forest areas: West Kilombero and New Dabaga Ulongambi are in the Udzungwa Mountain Forest Zone, and three of the forest areas: North Nyang'oro, South Nyang'oro and Kitapilimwa, are in the "miombo" woodland forest zone. The tenure on the forests is varied: two forests, (North and South Nyang'oro) are Government unclassified land. Three forests (West Kilombero, New Dabaga Ulongambi and Kitapilimwa) are Government Forest Reserves, and five forests (in the Kitapilimwa Zone) occupy Village Land and partly traditionally (privately) owned as so-called "malungulu" land.

The Beneficiary Assessment (BA) of the project originates in the Danida Review of MEMA Phase 1 and Formulation/Pre-appraisal of a Second Phase of July 2001. Chapter 7.2 "Lessons Learned During Phase 1" of the Review Re-

¹ MEMA is the Kiswahili abbreviation for Matumizi Endelevu ya Mali Asili (Sustainable Use of Natural Resources).

port emphasises the need for a discussion on implementation processes² carried out as a Beneficiary Assessment before planning a continuation of project activities:

"The project, therefore, does not possess any written documentation containing analyses of the type of problems encountered with PFM in the different areas where MEMA is operating, the ways in which such problems have been tackled, different views expressed by various groups of stakeholders during discussions of management plans at village meetings, the nature of participation of various interest groups in meetings and training sessions, villagers expectations in relation to what MEMA can do, etc."

The objective of the Beneficiary Assessment³ is therefore to assist the managers and users of the project at all levels to get a deeper understanding of the **processes** involved and **how** these are perceived by institutions and users at all levels involved in planning and implementing participatory forest management (PFM). The Beneficiary Assessment aims at providing the project management with information directly linked to improving management decisions and thereby implementation of the project.

The Consultant's Team (the Team) would like to express its thanks to all officials, institutions and individuals met and interviewed for their kind support and valuable information.

² A similar need that was expressed in the consultancy report: "Review of Joint Forest Management Activities, MEMA, August 2000, p.26. "Although there had not been any documentation of the processes in each of the five forest areas, there were the "outputs" from the process which allow at least some speculation about what the process may have been in each of the FMPs, and collectively".

³ See TOR, Appendix 1.

2 Executive Summary

The purpose of the Beneficiary Assessment of MEMA is to assist the management of the project with documentation and analysis of the processes involved in implementation of the project and to reveal how these processes are perceived by different stakeholders. The Beneficiary Assessment complements ongoing monitoring and aims at answering important questions raised in the Danida Technical Review of MEMA (July 2001).

The Beneficiary Assessment included three levels of beneficiaries: District staff and managers, village management, and sub-village users. At district level staff and managers of various government departments, NGOs and political leaders were interviewed individually. At village level the Village Councils and Village Natural Resources Committees were interviewed using focus group discussions. At sub-village level primary and secondary users of the forests were interviewed individually using conversational interviews. In total, 103 persons were interviewed individually (staff, NGOs, political leaders, and users of the forest), and more than 150 members of village management participated in 16 focus group discussions in 8 project communities.

2.1 Main Findings

The project has induced a major change in the way foresters operate and are perceived in Iringa District. The project has made foresters work for and with the communities. Participatory Forest Management (PFM) Plans have been developed in all involved villages and all interviewed staff appear to be aware that implementation of the PFM Plans (i.e. the coming year's activities) will be crucial to the success of the project. So far, the project has not achieved much impact on the ground in terms of forest conservation, sustainable forest utilisation or poverty alleviation. But there are high expectations, especially at district level, that the implementation of the PFM Plans can contribute to poverty alleviation. There are fears, however, that the project will not reach a second phase and that communities will be disappointed.

The village management and in particular the Village Natural Resources Committee (VNRC) members have been trained and sensitised intensively. But in half of the communities included in this assessment there is confusion as to the roles, mandate and responsibilities between the VC and VNRC to an extent, which calls for intervention. While the Village Councils (VC) and the VNRCs now appreciate the importance of conserving the forests, most VCs and VNRCs

are doubtful regarding substantial economic benefits from PFM - especially in the short term. The project's assumption about economic benefit to communities is in most cases not perceived as viable by these institutions.

As a result of the project and decentralised natural resources management, VNRCs have been burdened with patrol work and the problems encountered with these completely overshadow their other responsibilities. So far there has been no specified system to motivate them and to compensate for their time spent on patrols.

A core problem in the development of the PFM Plans has been that the users were not properly consulted. The users were only consulted village assemblies when the already formulated draft PFM Plan was presented. The important aspect in all participatory development work of developing ownership through allowing all partners - but in particular users - to have full access to information and decision making was not taken into consideration. In the PFM planning process, the users were only allowed to "comment and applause".

Beneficiaries' Perception of Their Role in Planning and Implementing PFM

Staff have benefited tremendously from the capacity building activities including access to allowances and transport. In addition, the former role of the forester as a "forest policeman" is gradually changing to a much more appreciated role as a "friend of the community". This new role of foresters is seen as a major achievement of the project. Control and patrolling functions have, however, to a large extent been transferred from foresters to village management. The Team has noted that the project is much aware of the implications and risks related to this and is trying to take the necessary measures.

At village level, many VNRCs and VCs have not interpreted, fully understood and implemented their respective role and responsibilities along the lines envisaged by the project. There is thus urgent need to educate the village level institutions on their respective roles and responsibilities. In addition, more than half of the users interviewed at sub-village level tend to recognise the VC - not the VNRC - as their most important partner in project planning and implementation.

A considerable number of users, including those negatively affected by restrictions in the PFM Plans, do not see any role and responsibility in PFM planning but only see restrictions. Among these are pastoralists, but also poorer farmers. Many users interviewed claimed to have no role and responsibilities, as they were not informed about the PFM activities. Female users interviewed were much more often than men not informed about the activities and consequently had no perceived role and responsibilities.

Capacity Building Activities

The fact that staffs with project funding (allowances and transport) got an opportunity to fully utilise their work capacity has been highly motivating, and staffs have gained experience in fields they formerly were not familiar with.

Though all involved VNRCs have been trained, several of the committees have experienced a high turnover of members and the internal dissemination of knowledge appears to have been inadequate for new members to fully comprehend key concepts of PFM. In addition, training has focused on selected members of the VNRC (in most cases the chairman and secretary) with the result that the management of the VNRC is far more informed than ordinary members. Moreover, chairmen and secretaries are all men (except one).

The training of VNRCs has not included "Training of Trainers", which adds to the problems related to dissemination of knowledge; not only within the committees, but also in terms of training community members.

Finally, most of the members of VCs and VNRCs are not primary users of the forests and woodlands, and pastoralists are not represented at all. This has already had implications when planning PFM and will have even more implications now when the PFM Plans are to be tested and implemented.

Relations and Processes Between Institutions

The working relationship between foresters of Iringa District Council and the Forest and Beekeeping Division has improved markedly since the project started. Also, the relations with other government and local government departments have improved and were described as positive and conducive.

The existing work relations between the foresters and community management is that of working as partners and the new relation is recognised by most community management institutions.

Expectations to and Motivation for Participation

The general expectation of staff is that the project will soon start the actual implementation of the PFM Plans. The staff believe that communities expect tangible support very soon, which was confirmed by the majority of informants at village and sub-village levels. Other expectations were that communities will soon be able to manage the forest in a sustainable way, i.e. communities will not over-exploit the forest resources now that the mandate to manage the forests is handed over to them. Some staffs, however, expressed concern about passing the mandate for managing the forests to communities because communities still focus on exploitation rather than conservation.

Meeting expectations of beneficiaries is closely linked to their motivation. And as more responsibility and work is left with the VCs and the VNRCs the issue of motivation of these institutions becomes crucial to the success of the activities. VNRC members recognise motivating initiatives such as training, workshops, tree seeds and seedlings. However, they are increasingly concerned about the lack of financial incentives (allowances), transport (bicycles), and recognition/authority (uniform, boots and weapons). Leaving their family responsibilities and economic activities for whole days without any incentive to continue their patrols has made several VNRC members resign.

Primary users of forests and woodlands expect restrictions in their activities. They also expect the project to take initiatives to motivate their positive partici-

pation and somehow compensate for the restrictions. Nearly all women interviewed expect credit and that the project will create access to income generating activities - e.g. provision milking goats.

Users, who were not informed about MEMA and PFM (which was not an insignificant number), requested the project to inform them in order for them to participate. Especially women voiced this demand.

Other users face restrictions with regard to expansion of agricultural land, and these expect to be informed well in advance should they have to be resettled, and to be offered acceptable alternatives. The Team is concerned with the issues of PFM Plans' implications on land tenure to privately owned "malungulu" land. The Team has seen no discussion on the "malungulu" issue in the PFM Plans.

Gender, Youth and Poverty Alleviation Perspectives

A vast majority of informants at district level perceived the project as a programme that would assist the poor rather than the better-off in the communities. They strongly believed that the project will lead to poverty alleviation, because the poor now gets a chance to manage and utilise the forest legally, while in the past many of their activities were illegal.

Most of the staffs interviewed felt that gender issues were fairly well addressed in the project. However, the staff has not been able to ensure substantial female participation in training because the committees have few female management members. In addition, female members of VNRCs appear to be less informed and less involved in the committee work than male members.

The team is not convinced to which degree the staffs acknowledge women's key role as primary producers and users of natural resources for sustaining livelihood and poverty alleviation. Yet, several staffs did mention during interviews that they see women's usage of the forest as non-destructive, while men's usage often is highly destructive.

Many of the youths in the villages and sub-villages seek a cash income through pit-sawing, charcoal making, carpentry, fishing and intensive farming. They need income to establish themselves with a family and own house and are therefore very concerned about the restrictions of the PFM Plans and the possible negative impact on their economic activities.

Future Challenges and Suggested Improvements to PFM

While there is need for awareness raising and continued support it is also evident that the major challenge for MEMA is to get actual implementation started through support to users. In addition, many users (both men, women and youths) expressed a sincere wish to be much more involved in the planning processes.

MEMA activities have hitherto not been adequately integrated with other aspects of rural life, such as crop farming, livestock keeping, fishing and rural industries. Conservation of the forests may be perceived as a benefit in its own right by foresters, but poor people living from the resources of the forests can-

not afford such luxury. Therefore alternative sources of income and subsistence must be provided if these poor people are to participate in PFM activities. Many users felt that the needs of poor people should be much more reflected in the PFM plans and be considered in the development of the fee/permit system.

2.2 Recommendations

1. Develop a workplan for VNRCs to ensure increased transparency in the committees' work and to improve people's participation.
2. The project approach should now change from an awareness raising attitude to a management approach
3. Establish a member and training roster of Village Councils and Village Natural Resources Committees for co-ordination and to assess the need for training and follow-up training.
4. Develop allowance system for motivation and authority for continued patrols by communities
5. Assess the need for assisting the VNRCs in adjusting the levels of fees and permits so as to avoid jeopardising the livelihoods of poor forest user families.
6. Identify feasible and innovative alternatives and supplementary activities to raising trees and collecting honey.
7. Assess the implications of "Malungulu" land in different areas of Iringa District. Subsequently, assess the need to address this issue when the PFM plans are revised.
8. Formulate a gender and youth mainstreaming approach with a poverty focus and let this guide the formulation of new project activities
9. Rethink and mainstream fees/permit system, for example through re-consideration of flat rates in connection with payment of Development Levy, etc.

3 Approach and Method

3.1 Beneficiary Assessment - Presentation of Approach

Beneficiary Assessment is about answering the questions of **how?** and **why?** a certain process and activity took place and was perceived by beneficiaries, more than the outcome of that process - the **what?** When beneficiaries (managers and users) involved in a given activity develop an understanding of the processes, this provides strong basis for process-oriented decision-making and change management. The traditional assessment of what has taken place is not superfluous. However, when an activity goes wrong or becomes successful, its duplication, expansion, and repetition depend on the understanding of why that activity was successful - or not. A beneficiary assessment can in other words improve a process and activity to become more than just based on risks and assumptions - if not mere trial and error.

While the **target** of all beneficiary assessments is decision making of the management, the **goal** is the improvement of a particular project, policy and/or activity. Thus, the persons conducting an assessment should be of service to the managers but not be subservient to them. Similarly, the focus on the beneficiaries should not become an over-identification with their immediate interests. "Although the participant observer evaluator must know management, project, and beneficiaries well, his allegiance is to none of the three, but rather to what the project is meant to be"⁴.

As the beneficiary assessment discovers and analyses the processes involved in the planning and implementation of a given activity and recognises the perceptions, views and sentiments of beneficiaries, it simultaneously decodes and provides documentation to management on issues that have often been subject to non-substantiated speculations and rumours. And beneficiaries are given a voice both in the process of the assessment but also very much during reporting

⁴ Salmen, Lawrence F., "Listen to the People: Participant Observation Evaluation of Development Project, Oxford University Press, 1987. The 1987 publication is one of the first publications addressing Beneficiary Assessment. The Beneficiary Assessment Approach is later described at length in "Beneficiary Assessment - An Approach Described", Salmen, Lawrence F. World Bank 1995. Lawrence F. Salmen is researcher in the World Bank and has for some time been the driving force behind developing and implementing the idea of beneficiary assessment.

to management. Quotations and remarks from the beneficiaries are a substantial part of any beneficiary assessment reporting.

As mentioned the **focus** of beneficiary assessment is on the beneficiaries (users) of a development policy or activity and the **target** is the decision making of the managers responsible for that activity. In the case of the MEMA project, managers include management at government district institutions and local community institutions' levels.

Although the method of beneficiary assessment is based on qualitative techniques (e.g. Conversational Interview) the large number of qualitative interviews conducted provides an opportunity and a necessity for simple quantification. This simple quantification gives management documentation, which can facilitate the prioritisation of project changes.

In the case of the MEMA project, the Beneficiary Assessment will therefore:

- ? Assist the management of the project with documentation and analysis of the processes involved and how institutions, managers and users perceive the processes,
- ? Provide an excellent opportunity for the managers/implementers for adjusting and improving on planning and implementation processes - before implementation of PFM Plans fully takes of, and
- ? Provide an important supplement to the on-going monitoring and answers to questions raised in the recent Danida review of the MEMA Phase 1, which took place in July 2001.

During earlier project assignments, the Consultant has always stressed the importance of training and capacity building of government staff and local institutions while at the same time providing the project management with information and data directly linked to improving management and thereby implementation. The training aspect of government staff was particularly underlined when preparing and implementing the Socio-economic Baseline Study. The study made full use of the forestry staff in the participatory study process, where the result to a large extent succeeded because of their commitment. The training in partnership between Consultant and forestry staff was highly beneficial to both parties.

The Beneficiary Assessment did not provide the same direct participation of project staff as these were defined as beneficiaries, wherefore they can not e.g. conduct interviews. Yet, the Beneficiary Assessment gave staff another opportunity to familiarise themselves regarding an approach and method that today constitutes an important tool in process oriented development activities.

3.2 Beneficiary Assessment of the MEMA project- Method used

The Beneficiary Assessment included both management and implementers in institutions at the district level and managers at community level (Village Council (VC) and Village Natural Resources Committee (VNRC), and primary and secondary users of the natural resources at community level (see Appendix 2, District Beneficiaries Interviewed).

The sample of managers and implementers at district/ward/catchment levels was based on a long-list of all institutions with names of individuals that were (or had been) involved in management, administration and planning of project activities. Representatives from all institutions were interviewed and return-interviews were carried out with a few informants.

A careful sampling of (eight) communities (villages and sub-villages) and users to be interviewed was carried out.

Zone	"Easy Village"	Sub-village Selected	"Less Easy" Village	Sub-village Selected
Dabaga	Lulanzi	(users from a number of sub-villages belonging to Lulanzi)	Isele	(users from a number of sub-villages belonging to Isele)
Kitapilimwa	Mfyome	Matembo	Kitapilimwa	Ikongo
Nyang'oro (south)	Mangawe	Hollo	Mkulula	Luganga
Nyang'oro (north)	Migoli	Mwanyengo	Makuka	Nyamahato

Criteria for sampling of communities included:

- ? Geographical considerations including communities from all PFM zones.
- ? Thematic considerations including the different formal status of the forest/woodland (Forest Reserve, Village Land (woodland), woodland (privately owned "malungulu" land).
- ? "Easy" and "less easy" communities⁵.

⁵ Project management and a few foresters participated in the "easy/less easy" sampling. The "easy/less easy" criteria was based on whether a particular community had responded and participated in the activities of the project or responded and participated with less enthusiasm - thereby causing more work for the management and implementers. The Team found during the Beneficiary Assessment that the "easy/less easy" often coincided with the capacity - or lack of capacity of the community based management (VC and VNRC). The Team

- ? Accessibility - the Beneficiary Assessment took place at the end of the rainy season - and some project communities were not accessible.

Criteria for sampling of sub-villages and users⁶ in sub-villages included:

- ? All eight sub-villages visited belonged administratively to the community sample and were characterised by a presence of a substantial number of primary users of the natural resources. That was the same criteria for sub-village selection during the Socio-economic Baseline Study, wherefore the sub-villages included are identical.
- ? Accessibility - the Beneficiary Assessment took place at the end of the rainy season - and some sub-villages were not accessible.
- ? The sample of users ensured that primary and secondary users (men, women, youth, elders, pastoralists, and poor and less poor) were included.
- ? Moreover, the sample of users included users that were active in the PFM planning and users that had not been active in the PFM planning.

Conversational Interview Formats⁷ were developed for each of the Beneficiaries' categories. Most interviews/conversations/discussions with district managers, implementers and users were conducted as individual interviews. Each individual interview took between 1 - 4 hours to complete depending on the knowledge of the informant and his/her level of participation. Each group interviews took between 3 - 5 hours. The Team tested technique of group interview when interviewing users but found that the interviews became too dominated and influenced by a few informants' opinion and knowledge. All Village Natural Resources Committees and Village Councils were interviewed using group interviews. More than 150 members of VCs and Village Natural Resources Committees participated in the discussions. Additional discussions and return interviews were conducted to supplement and substantiate the findings during the first round of interviews. In all the Beneficiary Assessment conducted 103 individual interviews with beneficiaries at district level including

also found that "easy/less easy" as defined by the project management was partly influenced by whether or not a substantial number of villagers had turned up at village assembly meetings.

⁶ The Village Council and the Village Natural Resources Committee had the responsibility for identifying the users to be interviewed, which had some implications for maintaining the original sample. However, the overall sample is still representative according to the set criteria.

⁷ The Conversational Interview is a common interview tool used in beneficiary assessments together with participant observation. The Conversational Interview is in principle a checklist of important issues, which have to be discussed during the interview. However, other issues should be included as and when relevant to the interviewer or informant. This makes the Conversational Interview more flexible than the Semi-structured interview. When conducting a Conversational Interview it is important that the interviewer captures direct quotations. To perceive the idea and to successfully carry out Conversational Interviews need considerable skills and experience of the interviewer. Participant Observation will often need a longer time frame and comprehensive input than what is available during a short-term assignment. Still the technique provided an option during the MEMA Beneficiary Assessment to the extent possible.

management of the project, foresters, senior officers of Iringa District Council, Ward officers, NGOs representatives, officers from Community Development Department and primary and secondary users in the project communities using the sampling criteria mentioned above.

A first compilation of interviews was carried out with the purpose of establishing an overview of the data collected before situational analysis could be finalised. Moreover, the compilation of interviews, discussions and statements from beneficiaries provided the opportunity for simple quantification, which has been included in the situational analysis of this report.

The issues discussed and assessed with the various categories of beneficiaries are presented in TOR, see Appendix 1.

4 Main Findings and Situational Analysis

The main findings are organised according to the Beneficiary Assessment's key issues and processes as viewed by the beneficiaries and related to planning and implementation of the project at all levels:

- ? Perceived role and responsibilities of the various beneficiaries in relation to planning and implementing PFM
- ? Capacity building activities of beneficiaries
- ? Relations and processes between institutions and beneficiaries
- ? Expectations and motivation for participation
- ? Gender - youth perspectives - and poverty alleviation
- ? Challenges, problems and concerns encountered with PFM
- ? Suggested improvements to PFM

The Team has chosen in this report to present the findings from each group of beneficiaries, as the findings often differ between groups of beneficiaries. The Team has also included a substantial number of quotations from beneficiaries. The use of direct quotations from beneficiaries is of key importance to any Beneficiary Assessment. And the quotations should not be read as a "spice" or "condiment" to the text, but as the important and necessary documentation on which the situational analysis is based.

4.1 Project Activities and Processes at Management and District Institutional Levels

The project has been a major contributor to activate district staff. There is no doubt that they have benefited tremendously from the capacity building activities including access to allowances and transport. Prior to the project the activity level of foresters was much lower than today due to financial constraints. The project has made foresters **work for and work with** the communities. That is in itself a considerable achievement. In addition, assisting communities in developing PFM Plans for the natural resources constitutes one of the key outputs of the project.

All staff appear to be aware that implementation of the PFM Plans (i.e. the coming year's activities) will be crucial to whether the project will be a success - and whether it will actually manage to benefit the communities. Most of them are fully aware that so far the project has not achieved much impact on the ground in terms of forest conservation, sustainable forest utilisation or poverty

reduction. But there are high expectations that the implementation of the PFM Plans can contribute to poverty alleviation. There are fears, however, that the project will not reach a Second Phase and that communities will be disappointed after all the effort they have put into the process.

4.1.1 Perceived role and responsibilities of the district management staff in PFM planning and implementation

It is the general impression from the interviews that PFM has given foresters (both at district, division and ward levels) a much greater job-satisfaction. The former role of the forester as the “forest policeman” has been replaced by the much-appreciated role as a “friend of the community”; that is the forester, who assists villagers with training and technical advice, and provide inputs such as tree seeds and polythene tubes for seedlings. This new role of foresters is seen as an achievement of the project and major benefit from the project to the staff. Generally, it appears that foresters have taken up their new role and responsibilities with much enthusiasm. It should, however, be mentioned that although the awareness and attitude of foresters have changed dramatically, findings in the field and interview with foresters also indicate that the process of changing attitudes and acting accordingly has not yet been completed.

It should also be mentioned that the foresters still participate in patrols together with the VNRC and often added "forest guards". Since all VNRC interviewed view their role, responsibility (and problems) as dominated by patrols, the Team argues, that the forester is still partly seen as a policeman - now only working in a team. The longer time it takes before the PFM Plans to be finalised and thereby ready for implementation the higher the risk that the users will maintain a view of the VNRC/forester as patrollers.

The Team also recognises that the foresters have not fully taken up their responsibilities as facilitators and planners assisting the VNRC and VC to carry out their roles and responsibilities. No VNRC interviewed has comprehensive process-oriented workplan to guide them "what, when, how, who" tasks should be carried out. The VNRC depends to a large extent on visits and inputs from the forester making the work of both the VNRC and the forester ad hoc, lacking direction and very time consuming for the forester.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"The forests should belong to the people, and MEMA facilitates village ownership. MEMA should help the people in making charcoal burners buy permits from the village councils. In that way charcoal burning will become legal. But there is a risk that the village councils, to increase their revenue, will allow too many charcoal burners to operate. Therefore the foresters **must** assist people in keeping a focus on conservation also". (forester)

"MEMA can finish any time – donors often do that. But we will still continue on our own" (NGO representative)

"There is a risk that we are pushing too many of our responsibilities on to the communities. On the other hand, villagers can, when properly sensitised, probably protect and manage the forest better than us". (IDC officer)

4.1.2 Capacity building activities at district level

The fact that staff with project funding (activities, allowances and transport) got an opportunity to fully utilise their work capacity has been highly motivating, and staff have gained experience in fields they were not familiar with (e.g. community development). In addition, they have been exposed to PFM in other countries through study tours (Uganda, Namibia, Zimbabwe) and in other parts of Tanzania. Apparently, the study tours in Tanzania were the most useful ones, from where things could be applied. Yet, several of the topics and issues studied have only partly been introduced in the communities.

Likewise with training activities, there is need for follow up. One could state that the capacity building activities of staff and communities are halfway. The awareness, interest and curiosity has been raised (and the study tours have indeed been beneficial in this respect - also to VNRC and VC members), but now there is need for planning, demonstrations and management of the new concept and approach.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"I suppose people at district level so far have benefited more from MEMA than the people in the villages. But in the future they will get revenue collection. In the past, it was the middle-class in the villages who benefited from the forest. Now everybody should get their share". (IDC officer)

"One important thing I learned from the study tour to Arusha and Babati was to use taboos to scare people from starting wild fires. I will see if I can use that once the PFM Plans have been approved". (forester)

4.1.3 Relations between institutions at district level

In spite of the prevailing differences in approach between FBD foresters and IDC foresters, the approaches were described as being much more similar now as compared to the past. The working environment and the collaboration were generally assessed as conducive.

The working relationship between the foresters and the staff of other IDC departments such as community development, lands, and agricultural extension has improved since the project started. In the past foresters used to experience that they were not really recognised by other departments. Now the presence of the project has facilitated a process whereby foresters (and community-based forestry work in general) gain recognition from the other departments. The involvement of Community Development Department staff has been important for the social mobilisation processes, just as the extension work provided by the agricultural staff. Nevertheless, the Team finds that the involvement of Com-

munity Development Department and agricultural extension staff has had limited impact in the PFM Plans with regard to e.g. gender, local economic development, agricultural techniques and poverty alleviation, as these issues are not reflected or incorporated in the PFM Plans. Issues that were expected to be highlighted by the inclusion of agricultural extension staff and staff of the Community Development Department.

No major disputes or problems regarding collaboration at district level were mentioned, and it appears that through the project all staff seem to gain some benefits, be it allowances, training, funds for activities, participation in study tours, etc.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"The FBD is not really understanding the importance of stakeholder involvement, and like many ministries they are not very prepared to give up responsibilities to IDC. But still, the relationship has improved a lot in the last few years". (IDC officer)

"In the past we (FBD and IDC) were apart. But now we are in the same pot". (forester)

"When MEMA started, so many NGOs in Iringa came and wanted support from the project – but some of them had never worked with the communities and they just wanted money. MEMA now only supports four NGOs and that is because we are serious about development". (NGO representative)

"Local politicians involved in illegal hunting, timbering, and charcoal burning may be hesitant to participate and support these activities. They may try and convince people not to participate in village planning and management. But the way management at village level has been set up is transparent and village government will have to be accountable to the villagers, so there is very little risk of fraud". (IDC officer)

4.1.4 Work relation to Village Council, VNRC and the users

Generally, the relationship to Village Councils and the VNRCs were described as positive. No one was concerned about this and no one described the work relation as negative.

The work relation to the users is seen as substantially improved, because foresters are no more seen as policemen. People used to run away when they saw them. According to the beneficiaries at district management level that does not happen anymore. On the contrary, people welcome them and request them to come back soon when they leave.

The relationship between VC and VNRC was a bit unclear. Many found it to be problem-free, while others admitted that there had been problems in the beginning. Apparently, no staff were very concerned about these problems or the

community management in general. One informant claimed that all villages in Tanzania are now supposed to have a VNRC and that this belongs to the Village Government's administrative structure as a sub-committee under the Village Council's Social Services and Self-reliance Committee.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"In the village committees, it is very important to have strong and influential people **and** people who use the forest (like hunters, collectors and charcoal burners) to ensure the right support to the PFM activities". (IDC officer)

"Many of the foresters tend to remain at village government level. They do not really know what is going on among the real users of the forests and they do not visit them". (NGO representative)

"Before MEMA, when there was a wild fire, people didn't do anything to stop it. They thought it was the job of the forest officers. But now, people understand that the forest is theirs, and that is thanks to MEMA. I expect that to continue". (forester)

"Since we started MEMA, people are changing, their attitude is changing. But it takes a long time for people to understand conservation and the potentials that will still be there". (IDC ward officer)

(participation and justification of the project) Responses ranged from answers like "everyone in the villages is so happy about MEMA" to "in a village where I work, only few people see the need for Joint Forest Management". (foresters).

"In the beginning, people didn't understand MEMA. They thought the forest was to be managed by the MEMA Department, that is, the "Wazungu" (white men). But then they realised that MEMA is a way to facilitate and that the natural resources are their own. Farmers expect to benefit from these resources". (forester)

"Now people in the villages understand and appreciate that they are allowed to take and utilise **some** forest resources - and that they can plan for this utilisation themselves". (IDC officer)

"Those who are reluctant to participate in MEMA are those doing illegal things". (forester)

4.1.5 Expectations and motivation for participation

The general expectation of staff is that the project will now start focusing on actual implementation, i.e. to support communities in their activities and provide inputs to them. The staff believe that communities expect some more tangible support very soon, and they expect the project to provide this. Another expectation was that the project would continue one more year in Phase One, and then continue with a Phase Two for another 3-4 years.

Other expectations included:

- ? That communities will soon be able to manage the forest in a sustainable way, i.e. communities will not over-exploit the forest resources now that they are given the mandate to manage the forests.
- ? Many staff members apparently believe that the sensitisation has been sufficient for communities to understand the value of the forest in terms of conservation rather than the previous perception by communities of the natural resources as an economic asset.
- ? Somehow many foresters appear to believe that communities have adopted the foresters' own perception of the forest as something good in itself that needs to be protected. Other foresters expressed concern about passing the mandate of the forest to communities because communities still focus on exploitation⁸ rather than conservation. However, they appeared to believe that in a matter of time the foresters' conservation-oriented perception is adopted by communities.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"If you calculate it per village, a lot of money is spent in this project, but I do not see many benefits for the people in the villages...". (district manager)

"I expect communities will gain from the forest use, but I doubt if there will be enough gains for people to actually conserve the forest. This is, however, not only my concern in relation to MEMA, but in relation to participatory forest management in Tanzania in general". (IDC officer)

"It is too early to talk about benefits for the communities. They have been trained, they are happy that bee keeping is now allowed in the forest, and there is keen interest. But there is still some way to go to ensure the conservation of the forest and the woodlands." (forester)

"In the beginning communities expected more direct benefits, but now the expectations have been adjusted to become more realistic. I do not think their expectations will be a problem anymore". (forester)

"MEMA has more than fulfilled the expectations. MEMA has showed a way forward not only in terms of forestry, but in village management of natural resources and village empowerment". (IDC officer)

"There will be better management of the forest after MEMA, but there is not really better livelihood for the people. MEMA is just a few small steps forward. But that **is** still encouraging". (IDC officer)

"Before MEMA there were no study tours, seminars and workshops for us. Through MEMA we get access to these new things". (forester)

⁸ Project staff often uses the term "exploitation". The Team prefers the term "economic use".

"My expectations have been half met. We are still in the first phase – I look forward to the implementation". (IDC division officer)

"My expectations have been met to a certain extent. People are not so quiet anymore. Forest management has come into the open – also the illegal activities – and that is good. But we are still waiting for the plans that are on the DED's desk". (forester)

4.1.6 Gender - youth perspectives - and poverty alleviation

A vast majority of informants perceived the project as a programme that would assist the poor rather than the better off in the communities. They strongly believe that the project would lead to poverty alleviation, because the poor now gets a chance to manage and utilise the forest legally, while in the past many of their activities were illegal. The legalisation of the activities of the poor will indeed be a major achievement? The issue is discussed further in Sections 4.2 and 4.3.

In terms of gender, most informants felt that there was some gender concern in the project and gender awareness training had been held for staff. Yet, the project includes no female field staff.

Several informants at district management level suggested that separate women's meetings should be held, so that women's needs and concerns could be discussed. A report from the women's meeting could then be presented to the VC. Informants also mentioned that only a few women participated in the awareness raising and training at community level. The reasons for this given by the staff were that "women do not have capital to start new things", "they didn't dare because it was a new activity", and "they are not used to be trained". These quotations are generally unacceptable and have to be addressed.

In terms of making the promoted technologies gender sensitive, a bee keeping officer reported that he had promoted beehives not to be elevated from the ground (because women are not used to climb trees), and that beehives could be made out of large, worn-out cooking pots - not in need for major capital or labour investments⁹. Such an idea needs demonstration but are nevertheless highly important for the involvement of women in natural resources management, and probably worth more than days of "gender sensitisation".

The Team is not convinced to which degree the staff acknowledge women's role as primary producers (e.g. agriculture, income generation activities) and users of natural resources for sustaining livelihood and poverty alleviation (e.g. domestic firewood collection, provision of drinking water). Several staff did, however, mention that they generally see women's usage of the forest as non-destructive, while men's usage often is highly destructive.

⁹ This is an example of awareness raising/attitude creation without demonstration. All beehives for demonstration the Team has seen in the communities are the wooden type.

Neither is the Team convinced that the staff are aware of the youths seeking a cash income in the rural areas through pit-sawing, charcoal making, carpentry, fishing and intensive farming in those years where they have to establish themselves with a family and own house. Several youth users (e.g. carpenters, pit-sawers) interviewed were much concerned with the restrictions of the PFM Plans and their negative impact on their economic activities. The Team does also believe that the aspect of value adding to natural resources in the rural communities has been somehow neglected and not influenced the PFM Plans. When other countries in Africa are concerned with timber logs being harvested in the forests and taken out as logs, without any value-adding and income generation to the rural population, the value-adding pitsaw activities in the forests and woodland is an example other countries would envy Iringa District. Likewise with the carpenters, who have invested time and money in a carpentry education and now add value to their natural resources within in their rural communities¹⁰.

All informants explained that the project's approach and PFM were not easy to understand for the communities in the beginning. Only through continuous sensitisation, meetings, training and follow-up have people begun to understand. Informants also noted as a problem that by-laws are not yet all formulated and approved.

Moreover, several informants (not only youth) at community level saw it as a negative impact of the project that there are going to be tight restrictions to natural resources' usage for some users as laid out in some PFM Plans. And some suspicion towards foresters still appears to remain among villagers in certain areas.

One district level officer claimed that it was a problem that the project was **donor-driven**. Too many of the activities did not come from the people – or the staff members for that matter.

The Team rather believes from listening and analysing information from the community level that the problem is related to project design and activities being **supply-driven and not demand-driven**. And therefore the project is yet to fully demonstrate its demand-responsive capacity with regard to - innovation, flexibility, process management, problem resolution facilitation, gender - youth responses, poverty alleviation etc.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"In order to get women more involved, we need to have women's committees at village level and meetings for women alone. We do not want the women to be passive partners". (IDC officer)

¹⁰ Most integrated rural development and poverty alleviation strategies emphasise the need for sustaining a livelihood in the rural areas for the youth, since negligence of this issue often leads to the negative economic and social consequences of rural - urban migration.

"I sometimes tell the foresters that they should be concerned about the poor, because the poor cannot afford to think about the environment when they are hungry. Only when there is food in the stomach can you start thinking about the trees. But then the foresters tell me that they deal only with the environment". (NGO representative)

"In the beginning, many disliked MEMA because with the new PFM Plans they will have to "buy" and pay for things, which they used to take for free. This attitude has changed now, but I still think the poorest people are afraid that CBWM will make them even poorer". (forester)

"Most of the very poor people are not involved, and very poor people want land in the forest. Now their fellow villagers can prevent that. The village government can also prevent people from collecting in the forest, and the poor people who depend of the forest constitute about 20-30% of the villagers in many areas". (IDC officer)

"The majority of people are pleased with PFM. Even poor people are happy, because they think it will be better to get a permit from the Village Council than from the District Council. This will reduce illegal activities". (forester)

"People generally like this approach, because it gives them power to punish those who do illegal things – even if it is the forestry officer who does it! Therefore only the villagers who do illegal, are against MEMA". (forester)

"The poor people in my area are going to get free permits to do their things in the forest, therefore poor people will also benefit". (forester)

4.1.7 Challenges, problems and concerns encountered with PFM

Several challenges, problems and concerns as perceived by the management at district level have been included and analysed above. The Team decided that a return-interview with a forester deserves more attention (see Box Text 1 below) as it covered most of the crosscutting issues.

Box Text 1: A discussion of important issues with a district management level beneficiary

Participation: "We called meetings between village leaders and influential elderly farmers and livestock keepers¹¹, drew village maps, and identified areas to be set aside for grazing...".

"It has been difficult to involve other users such as carpenters, boat makers and charcoal burners. "They are involved in illegal activities... we will get them

¹¹ The statement does not conflict with the later statement (see **Grazing**). There is a great difference in calling individual livestock keepers - many of whom are crop farmers first and foremost and then calling livestock owner groups (e.g. Maasai) that have a completely different livelihood, access to and usage of the natural resources.

when then the (PFM) Plan becomes operational. First of all we need to identify who they are. It can be said that they only participated as ordinary villagers, not according to their activities".

Farmers without own land and tree planting: "Most villages have no problem of land shortage. For example, Itagutwa village has taken over a Greek settler farm. The problem is monopolisation of village land by a few individuals and leaders. In progressive villages such as Lulanzi, even women are allocated land by the village government, but in some villages the village leaders and a few individuals are the ones who benefit from village land". (The view of the forester is challenged by interview with the Lulanzi VNRC, see **Box Text 2**)

Gender aspects of participation: "The VNRCs are required to include 30 per cent women. In the ZPT it was 50 per cent. Although we have succeeded in ensuring the inclusion of women in such bodies, we have not succeeded addressing the concerns of women (e.g. the need for micro projects). Also, women's inclusion in study tours is limited – if training is targeted to chairmen and secretaries and there is no woman in these positions, they are left out. Only in Nyang'oro village do they have a woman as the VNRC chairperson. Also, the project has not done much to ensure the participation of the youth".

Composition and duties of the VNRCs: "The selection of the VNRCs was based mainly on gender and geographical representation, that is, all sub-villages had to be represented. Also, the members had to be sound of mind and residents of their areas. The composition of VNRCs did not consider whether the members were primary users of natural resources or not. As guardians of natural resources in their villages, the VNRCs were given the responsibilities of mobilisation, extension and patrolling. Now the project has realised the mistake of mixing extension and police duties, so it is now training "forest guards" to enable the VNRCs to concentrate on mobilisation and extension work only".

Restrictions, permits and fees associated with the PFM Plans: "If prioritising protection, economic development and poverty alleviation, the PFM Plans were oriented firstly towards economic development, followed by protection, and lastly poverty alleviation".

Some of the rates were proposed for the purpose of conservation. For example, in Kitapilimwa it was proposed to charge Tsh. 12,000 for a 7 ton lorry of firewood, although in Iringa one pays only Tsh. 7,500 for that amount. The project (and villagers) set high fees to discourage urban dwellers from flocking to Kitapilimwa for firewood.

On villagers residing inside the PFM Plan established Nyang'oro village forest: "Those inside will not be expelled, but the area surrounding their homestead will be marked. No expansion will be allowed. If they have children, the village should allocate other areas for them". "This year a registration of farmland/settlements inside the village forest will take place. We should have done this before drawing the boundaries".

On grazing fees: "We never consulted the livestock keepers as a group. Vil-

lages such as Kiwere and Chamdindi have Maasai in their village government. However, the Maasai have no voice, even if they stay in an area for 10 years".

“Malungulu” (private) land rights and PFM: "We will only respect the "malungulu", which is already cultivated. The Village Council should allocate any uncultivated "malungulu" to the needy villagers. In the village forest we will respect rights over land, which is presently being cultivated. We (the project) will not allow any expansion of agricultural land. Outside the village forest, 'smart' "malungulu" owners have planted trees to protect their rights on their land".

“All people were relocated to Ujamaa villages. To abandon the Ujamaa village is to break the law. If all people were to return to their "malungulu" there will be no Nyang'oro PFM Plans".

4.1.8 Suggested improvements to PFM

Common replies were awareness raising, continued support, and meetings. Some of the staff also informed that they had made an effort to advise VNRCs to keep fees and permits at a low level, so that people could “afford” them.

Several staff members had also encouraged village committees to ensure that usage of the natural resources will be “free of charge” for villagers and subsistence use, while outsiders will pay for utilisation of the natural resources.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"I am concerned about the users in Udekwa. Why should villagers patrol the forest, when hardly anyone but we comes to the forest...? They might lose interest in the management of the forest due to this". (forester)

"MEMA should remain close to the people. There should always be follow-up". (forester)

"Since there now is good government guidelines for community-based forest management, the village governments should be in the driving seat from the very beginning". (IDC officer)

"Communities should be assisted to become more productive (for example through better soil fertility management) and to improve the marketing of their products. But this is not only MEMA's responsibility, it is the responsibility of Iringa District Council". (forester)

"You know, people value things that are measurable – tangible benefits. MEMA is not providing these...". (forester)

"Those who are hesitant or reluctant to join PFM must be convinced – or forced. Democracy doesn't work that well anyway!". (IDC officer)

"The technical advisers should have assisted communities in estimating the carrying capacity of their forest. For example, how many bags of charcoal can be harvested from a village's forest every year without over-utilising the resources? Such exercises could have been extremely useful in assisting villagers to plan realistically". (district officer)

4.2 Community Management Level, VNRC and VC

The Beneficiary Assessment indicates that there has been intensive training at the village management and in particular to the VNRC members. In half of the communities included in the Beneficiary Assessment there is confusion as to the roles, mandate and responsibilities between the VC and VNRC to an extent, which needs intervention.

Much of the training and awareness raising of the VC and VNRC have had a positive impact to the communities in the sense that villagers that have been informed better appreciate the importance of conserving the forests for future benefits. However, most VCs and VNRCs are doubtful regarding substantial economic benefits - especially in the short term. The project's assumption that the fees/permits would bring about economic benefit to communities is still not recognised or perceived as viable by the VCs and VNRCs.

The patrol work is a burden to all VNRCs. And for most VNRCs the patrols and the problems encountered with these completely overshadow their other responsibilities. So far there has been no specified system to compensate for their time and energy and motivate them for the work.

4.2.1 Perceived role and responsibilities in PFM planning and implementation

The project has promoted a very uniform (blanket) institutional approach at community level with a focus on training and capacity building the VNRC but also including training of the management of the VC. The idea has been that the VNRC should take care of the day-to-day operations of the activities, while the VC should maintain its role as overall manager and supervisor of the VNRC - and secondly the activities. In general, the role of the VC is to oversee that all development activities introduced and implemented in the village are legally approved by the elected VC and received and accepted by the community as a whole. Therefore the duty of the VC is to monitor all project activities and ensure that the community at large has information regarding the activities, as only information is the starting point for people's participation. With regard to the project it is also the VC's responsibility in collaboration with the VNRC to formulate village by-laws in an effort to protect the natural resources and ensure that those who temper with the village by-laws are punished when caught committing an offence.

However, not all VNRCs and VCs have interpreted, understood and implemented their respective role and responsibilities along those lines. Moreover,

the institutional starting point in some instances disfavours the institutional approach. The Team has made the following observations:

- ? In cases where the VC is less organised and less interested in project activities, the VNRC tends to dominate the management and implementation of activities. This leads to conflicts between the VNRC and the VC over mandate, role and responsibilities. In some instances it has already negatively influenced the planning and implementation of project activities - e.g. the VNRC arrests a culprit in a protected forest zone but the VC takes no action when the case is presented to them - and often the illegal activity continues.
- ? In cases where the VC is strong and interested in the project activities, it often find problems with the VNRC taking its own decisions and often not keeping the VC informed about their activities. These VCs often complained that too much attention is paid to the VNRC by the project and a tendency exists to overlook the mandate and role of the VC.
- ? In no cases have the conflicts between the VC and VNRC been discussed between the two partners and a solution found. All conflicting partners are asking the project to educate the respective partners on their respective role and responsibility.
- ? More than half of the users interviewed at sub-village level tend to recognise the VC - not the VNRC - as their most important partner in project planning and implementation. Some users are confronted with restrictions in their future usage of the natural resources. They have the experience that other major problems facing them are always best discussed with the VC, because it has a recognised legal mandate.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"Our role is to educate the community about environmental management" (VNRC - several - and also VCs)

"We shall call sub-village meeting and instruct them that if they cut a tree they should plant five tree seedlings as compensation". (VC)

"Our role is to encourage tree planting". (VNRC - several - and also VCs)

"There is a communication breakdown between the VC and MEMA". (VC)

"We should benefit from fines (allowance) - but Village Council has all the say at the moment". (VNRC)

"The Village Council (is my preferred partner in PFM) because I can easily run to the VC for help when I have a problem". (user - several)

"MEMA is the most important partner. VNRC is not active. The VNRC is here only to harass people. The VNRC only confiscate e.g. people's charcoal. The

Village Council is also not so active - they only do something after the arrival of MEMA people". (user)

4.2.2 Capacity building of VNRC and VC

All VNRCs and VCs recognise and appreciate the comprehensive capacity building undertaken by forestry staff of their respective institutions! The most important capacity building activities are:

- ? Awareness raising/attitude creation to understand the importance of sustainable management of natural resources and the role and responsibilities played by VNRC and VC.
- ? Training and facilitation in connection with planning and drafting PFM Plans. The planning and facilitation have included planning and budget training.
- ? Training and demonstrations in mainly bee-keeping, tree planting, the importance of using fuel saving stoves, and how to sustain natural resources.
- ? Study tours to visit and discuss relevant activities in Iringa Region and other regions as well.

The VNRCs and VCs now await the PFM Plans to be finalised, approved and endorsed by Iringa District Council, before these can be tested/implemented. Positively, some VNRCs have already partly started to implement some issues in the PFM Plans.

However, even as the Team fully recognises the comprehensive awareness raising and the fact that the PFM Plans are yet to be tested, the Team, VNRCs and VCs have some concerns:

- ? The VCs and VNRCs often have unresolved and counterproductive conflicts between themselves.
- ? Several VNRCs experience high turnover of members, meaning that new members are less informed than old ones.
- ? Training has focused on selected members of the VNRC (in most cases the chairman and secretary) with the result that the management of the VNRC is far more informed (and feels more involved and responsible) than ordinary members who often feel their participation is neglected and less important.
- ? Moreover, chairmen and secretaries are all men (except one female VNRC secretary in Nyang'oro village). This results in female members being far less informed and therefore involved than male members. The VNRCs' internal lack of information is also influenced by some VNRC managements' maintaining a top-down approach.
- ? Finally, crop farmers dominate all the VCs and VNRCs, while the primary users of the natural resources (including pastoralists) are rarely members (or active members¹²) in the VCs and VNRCs. This has already had impli-

¹² The Team came across three instances where primary users of the natural resources and members of the VNRCs in Nyang'oro North were either ignored or directly unwanted in the

cations when planning PFM and will have even more implications now when the PFM Plans have to be tested and implemented.

The Team would like to add that the interviews and discussions with the VCs and VNRCs clearly indicate:

- ? That training has focused on promoting possible income generating activities e.g. bee keeping and tree planting.
- ? That training has been focused on theory and awareness more than "how to implement and manage".
- ? That training has not substantially included "training of trainers" techniques that will be crucial when VNRC members are going to inform, train and implement PFM Plans together with the users in the sub-villages.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"It (the training) enabled me to understand the importance of the forest to my daily life, i.e. that the Forest Reserve is also beneficial to my life for things like fuelwood, mushrooms, herbs etc." (VNRC - several)

"Bee keeping training was relevant but only theoretical". (VNRC)

"Yes, training was relevant because we used it in awareness raising at general village assemblies. However, we need more training on **how** to grow traditional trees and frequent refreshing seminars". (VC)

"Training on bush fire control was relevant and bush fires have reduced" (VC)

"Yes, the training was beneficial. We have been able to understand the types of trees to cut for what purpose, to prune trees instead of cutting a whole tree". (VC)

"Yes, Arusha study tour training was relevant - I can now make the stove. But the training was given to men and they don't cook". (VNRC)

"Training on protection of water sources was relevant but cultivation near water sources still continue". (VNRC)

"Training on bee keeping for all interested villagers not well attended. Priority of villagers is fishing and not bee keeping". (VC)

VNRC committee work. Two of these members believed that the VNRC did not want them, as they were raising too many questions and critical issues regarding the participation of users (including pastoralists) and the formulation of PFM Plans. The third member was a Maasai, that had never attended any VNRC meeting - and therefore was not aware of the restrictions imposed on his cattle's grazing in the area in future. In general none of the three members will be very efficient in their respective sub-villages. To ensure the success the MEMA should ensure the inclusion of more users in the VNRCs and that once they are members they are also listened to.

"Leadership training was relevant, but only two persons attended". (VNRC)

"VNRC members do not disseminate what they learn to us or to ordinary villagers. They only share the information among themselves". (VC)

"All I know (about MEMA) is that some people from our village went for seminar to learn how to make bee hives". (female user)

4.2.3 Work relation between FBD staff and community management level

The existing work relation between the foresters and community management is that of working as partners. Formerly the staff were seen as "forest policemen". Now, as the project has been in existence for nearly three years the "police" perception has changed among the foresters themselves and the new relation is recognised by most community management institutions. It is however noticed that control and patrolling functions to a large extent have been transferred from the foresters to village management, which could lead to a transfer of the "police"-issue as well. However, the Team has noticed that the project is much aware of this risk and is taking the necessary measures. The partnership relation between project staff and community management institutions allows project staff to give strong advise (if necessary) to the community management and also to use the management to transfer information and arrange meetings whenever an activity is planned by the project staff. The Team believes that the general positive work relation should also be used to find a solution to the recognised conflicts between the VNRC and the VC.

Some VCs complained to the Team that the project staff sometimes bypassed its office. Many VNRCs and Village Councils complained that letters to them often arrived late and attendance at meetings, seminars and village assemblies were negatively influenced.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"We (should) patrol twice a week after reporting to the VC". (VNRC - several - and VCs)

"We face patrol problems - no proper weapons, while the culprits are equipped with proper weapons - distance to the patrol area - and lack of boots and uniforms". (Nearly all VNRCs and VCs had very similar quotations and the issue of patrol was in all but two cases mentioned as their first prioritised problem.)

"They - MEMA staff - send a letter to inform that they would like to have an audience with villagers. However, they call the meeting too suddenly and it becomes a problem to convene the meeting". (VNRC and VC - several)

"Drama (HIV/AIDS) was interesting, but there was a short notice so attendance was poor". (VNRC)

4.2.4 The VNRC/VC's capacity building of users including information, planning, and implementation

The perceived and actual nature and level of capacity building of users through information and involvement in planning and implementation vary from community to community and from individual to individual. For the individual and some sub-villages it depends on how dependable the individual or sub-village is on the natural resources. Among some of these individuals (especially in the woodland areas) the community management is seen as an enemy to the person because of the enforcement of restrictions following the formulation of PFM Plans. Some of these critical users find their relation with the VNRC and VC further aggravated. They believe that the VNRC and VCs are the ones still practising illegal forest harvesting such as charcoal making, timber business etc. In such cases it is difficult to establish an encouraging environment facilitating capacity building, information, planning and implementation¹³.

In the Udzungwa Mountains the Team has identified a more positive relation between the community management and forest users. First of all the Forest Reserve has traditionally been respected and therefore the PFM Plans do not substantially interfere in the users' practises. Secondly, the users have few cattle, and very little grazing - if any - takes place inside the Forest Reserve. Finally, and perhaps most important the area has been home to a number of community forestry initiatives over the past 20 years resulting in tree planting of privately owned woodlots easing the pressure from the Forest Reserve.

In general project training and capacity building depend entirely on one institution's (VNRC) responsibility, willingness and capacity to inform the many dependants/users of the natural resources in the village and sub-village. The findings show that many users especially in the sub-villages and especially women are not informed and therefore not involved in the activities - and often demanded and requested the Team to ensure that they become informed and involved¹⁴.

The approach implies several challenges:

- ? As has been pointed out, most VNRCs have an internal problem of its management not informing members of the VNRC.
- ? The VNRCs interviewed are all aware that they could do much more to inform users, than the village assembly meetings that have been held. But in most cases the VNRCs request foresters to assist them (take the lead) in this task. Some VNRCs have not fully understood that they are responsible and also responsible for taking the initiative.

¹³ The Socio-economic Baseline Study, December 1999 has several findings pointing in the direction that the community management are often much involved in businesses related to the economic usage of the natural resources - e.g. as owners of pit-saws, which they rent to pit-sawers, linking outside charcoal buyers with charcoal burners, etc.

¹⁴ The lack of information regarding the PFM Plans has in several cases led to users being reprimanded and arrested for an illegal practise, while they were unaware of the new decisions and rules pertaining in that particular area.

- ? The VNRCs have not fully utilised the benefit of its composition with members representing all sub-villages in the village.

The continued planning and not least implementation of PFM Plans in the villages will largely depend on the understanding of these plans inside the VNRC and especially among users. If information and understanding is missing it will be difficult to involve users in actual management, implementation and monitoring of the PFM Plans - and only single awareness raising activities such as tree planting and bee keeping will be possible at user level. Fortunately, interviews indicate that most VNRCs and VCs expect the PFM Plans to progress beyond these awareness-raising activities. The expectations and challenges of PFM are long-term but have to be addressed at this moment.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"We have received training on tree planting and bee keeping". (users - several)

"I have a role in tree planting". (user - several)

"Tension with Village Council. They (VC) think we get something from MEMA - when e.g. patrolling and they don't do anything when we report farming activities inside the village forest area - we believe some corruption takes place". (VNRC)

"We VNRC members have become the enemies of many in the village and we are facing many threats from villagers". (VNRC)

"About MEMA I only know that there is a committee. I don't know who selected them". (user - several)

"The only people who know about the MEMA project are the VNRC and the VC. These are the ones attending MEMA meetings. There is no sub-village meeting that have been held to inform people about the meaning and benefits of MEMA". (user and one VNRC member (Maasai))

"We should only cultivate existing farms", "Don't cut trees, MEMA has come", I know MEMA is the sense that we have been barred from cutting trees". (several users)

"This (the Beneficiary Assessment interview) is my first discussion about MEMA. I have attended no meeting. They (the sub-village leaders) announce the things about MEMA, but no meetings are held". (female user)

4.2.5 Expectations and motivation for participation

Expectations among VNRCs and VCs vary and in general VNRC members have more expectations than the VC members do. Most of the VCs and VNRC members believe most of their expectation will be met in future, while others are more in doubt. In general expectations of most VNRCs and VCs' members include:

- ? Improved natural resources. And all informants agree that this particular expectation has a long-term perspective.
- ? Only very few VCs have economic expectations regarding income from issuing permits. The Team found this rather disappointing, as economic motivation and benefits are normally expected in PFM initiatives to motivate partners at the community level. However, the Team has learned through interviews with VCs, VNRCs and foresters that in many cases the permits/fees do not have **economy** as their rationale but rather **protection**. Introducing a high fee on some activities is meant to prevent users to continue that particular activity - not to generate income.
- ? All VNRC members interviewed have the expectation that the project will provide them with much needed uniforms, boots (and in some cases weapons) for their patrols and establishment of authority.
- ? All (informed) VNRCs and VCs members expect assistance (training, seeds, and seedlings) to embark or continue already ongoing tree planting and bee keeping.
- ? Those members of the VCs and VNRCs that have not yet participated in study tours and comprehensive training seminars expect to participate in such activities in future.
- ? Some VNRCs and VCs members also expect that restrictions regarding certain usage of the natural resources will negatively affect certain user groups.

Meeting expectations of beneficiaries are closely linked to their motivation. And as more responsibility and work is left with the VCs and the VNRCs the issue of motivation of these institutions becomes crucial to the success of the activities. Their participation and work related to a long-term goal of improved natural resources have to be met by short-term motivation and incentives.

Investments in future natural resources are easier to embark on if the benefits apply to the individual and even more so if the benefits include an economic benefit. Therefore tree planting and bee keeping have some motivating potential with individuals. It becomes more complex, when the work and responsibilities evolves around a long-term protection of a common natural resource. This finding associates well to the motivation of VNRC members.

VNRC members recognise motivating initiatives such as training, workshop, tree seeds and seedlings. However, they are increasingly concerned about the lack of financial incentive (allowance), transport (bicycles), and recognition/authority (uniform, boots and weapons). They complain about leaving their family responsibilities and economic activities for whole days without any incentive to continue their patrols. They often lack recognition and authority and are faced with negative remarks and threats from fellow villagers. Several VNRC members have already resigned and the present ones interviewed make it no secret that if no solution is found to their problem they might also resign.

In general, the Team would like to see the expectations of project staff, VNRCs and VCs being matched with a stronger ambition to fulfil them.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"We expect improved natural resources and improved water sources". (VNRC and VC - several)

"We now consider the Forest Reserve and woodland as our property". (VNRC and VC)

" We expect recovery of natural resources. Uncontrolled issuing of permits by the Iringa District Council has led to depletion of resources". (two VCs)

"Improved climate - more rain". (VNRC and VC - several)

"We expected to get credit for petty income generating activities, i.e. rearing of pigs and small ruminants, bee keeping". (VMRC - several)

"We expect revenue from tourists to view wildlife, lions, baboons etc." (VC - several including VCs in farming communities with no wildlife....)

"Uniforms: Without uniforms we look like cheats ("matapeli"). (VNRC)

"I expected to be provided with allowances, bicycles, and other benefits like during the CONCERN Project". (VNRC member)

"My expectations were that I would be paid some allowance to enable me to survive". (VNRC member)

"Lack of training on **how** to patrol". (VC)

"Participation of women on patrol work is difficult, because of their responsibility as mothers and wives and also because their husbands disagree". (VNRC - several)

"We need proper identity cards. Our lives are threatened. I have been in this committee for three years with very little benefit. I am getting tired". (female VNRC member)

4.2.6 Gender - Youth perspectives - and poverty alleviation

The problems related to women members of the VNRCs and VCs are important to the success of the activities. Only few women are members of the VCs and hold management positions. Only one woman has a management position in a VNRC¹⁵. The Team's findings clearly show that VNRCs' female members are all less informed and less involved in the VNRC work than the male members.

¹⁵ The VNRC secretary in Nyang'oro village.

This fact causes a serious problem to developing a gender response to the request from female users to be informed and involved¹⁶.

Only a few remarks from a few VNRCs indicate that they see a link between the PFM activities and poverty alleviation in general. However, remarks made by some VNRCs show their concerns regarding those users facing restrictions/threats to their immediate livelihood and future prospects based restrictions regarding their economic usage of the natural resources¹⁷. One VNRC was directly worried having to inform users with the restrictions following the introduction of PFM Plans.

This particular finding - but including others as well - pose a question to the **participatory** process applied when formulating the PFM Plans. It seems that part of the problem has been that **the users** were not properly consulted but only consulted as **villagers**, when the already formulated draft PFM Plans were presented at a general village assembly. An important issue when developing ownership and applying a participatory approach is to allow all partners - but in particular users - to have full access to information, participation and **decision making** and not only a **comment and an applause** when finalising a PFM Plan.

Box Text 2: Participation, forest management and PFM planning in Lulanzi community

The members of the VNRC in Lulanzi are all involved in farming (maize, beans), as well as tree planting on their own farm land – mostly fruit trees and pines. Tree planting was promoted in the late 1960s, during the Ujamaa days, and has since then been expanding in the community. Many villagers are now reaping from their private woodlots, selling a mature pine tree for Tsh. 300 - 400 to men who pit-saw the pine. While tree planting was started before the project, bee-keeping activities in the village were mostly promoted by the project, although (as noted in the 1999 MEMA Socio-Economic Baseline Study) modern beehives were introduced before the project by the HIMA project.

PFM activities in the village involve two areas – the NDUFR and a village forest reserve, which has been set aside through the PFM Plan. The committee members has high expectations about the former, ranging from a share of fees from research permits and eco-tourism, to fees from TANESCO for protecting the water source for the Mtera Lake/Dam.

Last year sixteen villagers were caught in VNRC patrols, most of them for "crimes" such as cultivating in the area set aside for the village forest reserve,

¹⁶ See Sections 2.2 and 2.3 of this Chapter.

¹⁷ The MEMA Socio-economic Baseline Study has identified that many of those users highly dependant on the natural resources for their livelihood are often the poorest individuals in the community.

and cultivating near water sources. It was mentioned that most offenders committed their "crime" because of ignorance about the new decisions taken by the VC and VNRC while others were in dire need of the land for farming. Some of those arrested came from the nearby community of Ihimbo. About seventy villagers have written to the village government this year, applying for cultivation plots. While in the old days the village could allocate up to 10 acres per applicant, these days it can allocate only 3 acres. In Lulanzi, if one does not cultivate his/her allocated plot for three years, the VC reclaims and allocates the land to another person. The general shortage of land and unequal distribution has also led to renting of land in the community. And often those who rent land are from outside Lulanzi.

The process of developing PFM Plans for the NDUFR included; (i) formation of the Zonal Planning Teams (ZPT) (two members later became members of the VNRC); (ii) surveying of the forest and compilation of the first draft PFM Plan; (iii) presentation of the draft PFM Plan to the village council, where it was discussed and amended accordingly, and (iv) presentation of the amended draft PFM Plan to the village assembly, where it was discussed and amended. The discussion was led by the two village representatives from the ZPT, with forestry and other technical experts in attendance to advise on technical issues. Finally, (v) the compilation of the second draft of the PFM Plan (to be submitted to the district authorities), incorporated the views and advice given in the different village assemblies but mostly changes suggested during a project workshop held in Iringa.

However, the village assembly meetings were not planning sessions or a substantial hearing. A few additions were made here and there, but the experts and the ZPT members dominated the planning process. Not all members of the VNRC were aware of the content of the draft PFM Plan, apart from two very vocal members, who happened to be the two former members of the ZPT and now VNRC secretary and chairman, respectively. A female VNRC member openly admitted that she did not know what was contained in the PFM Plan. It is therefore no surprise when offenders were caught because of ignorance regarding the PFM Plan.

The Team is fully aware that a natural resources initiative can not alone address the most important issue of poverty alleviation. Poverty Alleviation needs a multi-institutional and multi-sectoral approach, financial commitments, and political decision making. The VC is the institution responsible for poverty alleviation at the lowest administrative level in Tanzania.

The Team finds it promising that several VCs interviewed were interested in and concerned about the poverty alleviation aspects of the PFM activities. They acknowledge the possibility for future benefits from sustainable natural resources. However, their concern was not only with **protection** but also to secure the immediate livelihood (**economic welfare**) of the poorest individuals of their communities - some of which they found were confronted with negative changes in their usage of the natural resources following the PFM Plans. The project should utilise the concerns and consciousness of these VCs when im-

plementing the PFM Plans - and in future development of other activities. If not, the risk is that some VCs might not feel responsible and willing to fully implement the PFM Plan. The Team favours flexibility in the implementation of the PFM Plans! Yet the Team prefers that the flexibility is not a result of incomplete planning when preparing the PFM Plans.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"Poverty! Some people are forced to burn charcoal in order to earn an income". (VNRC)

"Other people do not participate as their activities (charcoal burning and pit-sawing) are against the project". (VC)

"The decision of permit fees was set by the Village Council with the aim to safeguard the forest from getting depleted". (VC)

"It looks like the bylaws and PFM Plans have been brought from above (VNRC member). The VNRC chairman interrupted: "representatives of villages (Makuka, Izazi, Migoli and Makatapora) met in Migoli¹⁸ to propose the by-laws - possibly we overlooked other groups' interests". (VNRC)

"The project insisted on the control of forest - many were restricted from the free use of forest resources i.e. timber production, charcoal making and hunting. Many got annoyed and were not interested. They say: "we don't want this MEMA project". (VNRC)

"(ownership) It (MEMA) is ours. We were told so in the beginning". (VC)

"(ownership) It is our project since it will enable us to benefit where before only a few individuals were benefiting". (VNRC)

"(ownership) Not everybody think MEMA is ours. Ordinary villagers think MEMA is these people with double-cabin Toyota, who come to look at their forest". (VC)

4.2.7 Challenges, problems and concerns encountered with PFM

The most important challenges, problems and concerns raised by the management at community level have been integrated in the above sections. Yet the Team has found it important to allow the voices of the community managements to be heard to support and substantiate the above situational analysis. The remarks below will also give the project management an idea of the different aspects raised by the beneficiaries at community management level.

¹⁸ An example where villagers were lumped together to comment on by-laws and PFM Plans. Participants should have walked, bicycled up to 40 kilometres if they wanted to participate.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"MEMA project comes to the village to discuss only about forests, but there has been no discussion on the dam and the lake (Mtera Dam/Lake) - or is it not a natural resource?". (VNRC)

"People need integrated activities and training rather than tree planting alone". (VC)

"The demarcation exercise has led to boundary dispute over agricultural land between Mfyome and Kiwere communities". (VNRC - also other VCs and VNRCs have mentioned border disputes as a result of demarcation)

"Maasai grazing their cattle in conserved areas will have to stop their practice. But the Maasai have been here for more than ten years and they otherwise participate in village life, e.g. their children go to school". (VC)

"Needs of livestock keepers neglected. They might not even find areas for watering their animals". (VC and VNRC - several)

"The project has caused a negative impact to those who were doing illegal hunting, timber activities, and shifting cultivation". (VC - several)

"VNRC has limited powers. We cannot force the eviction of people, who have settled in Kikuyu, which is an area that should be conserved as identified by MEMA experts". (VNRC)

"They (MEMA) put too many responsibilities on the villagers but less benefits to villages". (VC)

4.2.8 Suggested improvements to PFM

Suggested improvements to PFM originating at the community management level have been included in Chapter 5, Recommendations. However, improvements suggested by the community managements were many and show the commitment and interest of the community managements, wherefore the Team has decided to let some of the different suggestions to be voiced.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"(patrol) Provision of boots, uniforms, self defence training to the VNRC members". (VNRC and VC - several)

"More training on roles and responsibilities. Right now there is some power struggle between VNRC and the VC". (VNRC - several)

"Provision of more education and training chances to more committee members". (VNRC)

"Credit to villagers for income generating activities - as a motivation to participate in MEMA activities". (VNRC and VC - several)

"Education on how to improve soil for future increased crop production". (VC)

"We as villagers are not competent in law formulation. Therefore we need a law expert to help us with by-law formulation - and understanding". (VC)

"Education and demonstrations on how to improve soil for future increased crop production - now without farm expansion". (VC)

4.3 User Level - Village and Sub-Village

The Socio-economic Baseline Study (1999) of the project made it clear that not all villagers are equal in their access to and usage of natural resources. Better-off villagers are often landowners and farmers, while poorer individuals are characterised by a larger number of economic activities that constitutes their livelihood. Some of these poorer individuals' livelihood is particularly dependent on access to and economic usage of the natural resources in their immediate environment. And most of these users live in the sub-villages, [which are often situated long distances from the village centre](#).

The Beneficiary Assessment of users took its departure in the Baseline Study regarding location and socio-economic status of users. For the clarification and analytical purpose, the Team further refined the category of users into:

- ? **Primary users:** those depending on the natural resources for food and their livelihood in general (involved in pitsawing, commercial charcoal burning, commercial firewood collection etc.), and
- ? **Secondary users:** those depending on the primary users bringing the products forward for their activities and value adding. Secondary users are involved in activities such as wholesale of timber, charcoal, and firewood, carpentry (furniture, window and door frames, roof construction), canoe making, food making, smoking and frying of fish, brick making etc.

The sample of beneficiaries included in the Beneficiary Assessment included both primary users and secondary users. These were interviewed individually.

4.3.1 Perceived role and responsibilities in PFM planning and implementation

The most important findings regarding perceived role and responsibilities in PFM planning and implementation among individually interviewed **primary users** in sub-villages include:

- ? Those users that were informed and participated in PFM activities saw their role and responsibility to abstain from any illegal practise and to participate in tree planting and bee keeping. Few of them were able to see the larger context of the PFM activities.

- ? A considerable number of informed users including those negatively affected by restrictions in the PFM Plans did not see any role and responsibility in the PFM planning but only saw restrictions. Among these were pastoralists, but also poorer farmers depending on the natural resources.
- ? Many users interviewed claimed to have no role and responsibilities, as they were not informed about the PFM activities.
- ? Female users interviewed were much more often than men not informed about the activities and consequently had no perceived role and responsibilities.

Box Text 3: A Maasai family in Mfyome community, Kalenga Ward

The Maasai family moved from Kiteto-Kondoa area to Idodi Ward (Mlowa village) in 1978. In 1992 the family was expelled from Mlowa village to Kalenga Ward. On the family's arrival to Mfyome the family head presented his credentials to the VC and requested permission to stay and live in the village. The VC gave the family permission to stay and told the head of the family to look around the village and locate a place where he felt he could live with his family¹⁹. He found a suitable place - a piece of land just inside the borders of Kitapilimwa Forest Reserve. Surprisingly, nobody in the VC objected the family's choice.

The family's economy depends on cattle supplemented by some subsistence cropping around his compound. "I decided to do maize farming so if my children have appetite for fresh maize they shouldn't steal from the neighbour's farms". However he had to request for farming permission from the VC before he started farming and paid Tsh. 5000 per year for one acre to the VC. The farm is inside the Kitapilimwa Forest Reserve.

After nine years stay in Mfyome, the family received a letter in July 2001, informing that they had to move out of that area because the house and farm is inside the Kitapilimwa Forest Reserve.

The head of the family told the Team that he was shocked to get the move order and secondly he was concerned as to where he should move. He did the following:

- ? Wrote a letter to the VC informing them that he could not move out of the village because he has 14 children schooling in the village school in different classes and if moved it would disturb the children's school performance and attendance.
- ? In the letter he also wrote that his crops on the farm were not ready for harvest and he pleaded to be moved after the harvest, approximately July 2002.
- ? He also requested the VC to allocate him a new location within the village because he had no intention to move to another village.

¹⁹The man has a family of one wife, 4 children of his own and other relatives' children. In total the man has 14 schooling children dependent on him.

In response to the letter the VC promised to allocate him an area somewhere else and possibly in Matembo sub-village. The Team was informed that the VC had accepted to let him stay until after harvesting his crops. However, he was very concerned being shifted to Matembo sub-village as it would affect his family, because social services such as dispensary and school are far away.

The above incident will in future most likely be repeated in areas surrounding the Nyang'oro Village Forest as a result of the PFM Plans for that area (see situational analysis elsewhere in the report). The Team is also concerned with these present and future moving of families as many of these families closest to the natural resources often depend on these. In the case mentioned, the Team would also mention, that integration of Maasai into the general village life is encouraged by the Government of Tanzania and the above family is an example of an integrated family that now could face marginalisation. Finally, the Team has recorded several concerns from other families facing immediate or near future moving of the residence and agricultural activities. The implications are that certain segments in the communities perceive the project negatively. And the perceptions of these groups of people could spread unless the project takes time to revise PFM Plans and/or carefully explain to the most vulnerable groups what the actual and future consequences are of the PFM Plans.

Secondary users (informed) found no particular role and responsibility in the planning and implementation of the PFM Plans except from participating in the tree planting and other activities and "moral support" to the protection of their natural resources.

Some secondary users interviewed were concerned that their businesses might face difficulties, as products would be more difficult and more expensive to obtain from the primary users - and the woodland. This view was in particular voiced by local carpenters and canoe makers whose attitude towards the idea of the PFM Plans was very negative indeed! Other secondary users were less informed about the PFM activities and did therefore (perhaps) not share the concerns of the carpenters and canoe makers. Some informants in this group include fishermen, fish smokers and brick makers.

In this context the, Team has noticed that most fees and permits in the PFM Plans only addresses primary users, while e.g. a secondary user does not need any permit to expand his or her businesses. The Team believes this is a serious oversight in the development of the PFM Plans.

Box Text 4: Interview with village carpenters in Migoli

The primary and secondary users in Migoli include pit-sawers, charcoal makers, carpenters, canoe makers, fish smokers, brick makers, and "pombe" brewers. Utilisation of natural resources creates employment and a livelihood for an increasing number of people in Migoli, which is a very fast developing community due to the fishing activities on the Mtera Lake.

The carpenters interviewed were young men who had graduated from the Catholic Mission Vocational Training Centre in Ismani Ward. After their graduation as carpenters they joined efforts and formed a group of three carpenters - two graduated, one not graduated. They opened the carpentry workshop where they work today using among other tools, the tools they were given when graduating. The workshop has also employed two apprentices.

When asked why they had to move all the way from Kalenga Ward to Migoli they responded: "We search for survival. Where we succeed is where we will stay".

When asked if they knew about the project they responded in a very bitter manner. They said that they had heard about the project and had been invited to an information meeting - but they could not attend the meeting because they had a job to finish. However, they selected one to represent the group. They said that they did not see any importance of the meeting. They were only informed not to harvest the forest resource, until the system of fees and permits were in place. This means that anybody presently utilising the forest resource is doing so illegally and in future they will need a permit from the VC.

There is a strong interdependence between the economic and social development in Migoli and the primary and secondary users of the natural resources. The carpenters told the Team about the relationship between the availability of fish and their carpentry. In general the majority of the residents in Migoli depend on the fishing activities and when more fish is caught (seasonal or otherwise) the residents have money and spend on furniture and house construction (carpentry/brick making).

Apart from the carpenters' strong dependence on the fishing activities they also pointed towards other benefits of carpentry:

- ? Carpentry adds value to timber and people's livelihoods as the timber increases its value while being pit-sawn and developed into a long list of products by the carpenters.
- ? Carpentry creates markets for timber and at the same time it creates jobs for pit-sawers
- ? Carpenters create training/jobs (education/apprenticeship) for youth.
- ? Carpentry is a new job possibility for women: While majority of furniture makers are male youths, it was encouraging to learn that one young woman from Iringa, who graduated from VETA in Iringa is doing carpentry and house roofing jobs in Migoli. As a response to this another young woman from Migoli is undergoing vocational training in carpentry at the Catholic Mission Training Centre in Migoli.

This is an indication that with more awareness raising and active role models, young women might seek new job opportunities such as carpentry. However, the young women need encouragement and sensitisation. Women have recently started doing masonry and other construction work in Dar Es Salaam. In a developing community like Migoli, where brick houses are being built at a very fast rate, masonry could also provide an income to young women in future.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"I have a role in tree planting". (user - several)

"I have a role in improving the forest by reducing or stopping the charcoal activities and involving myself more in honey production". (user - some with similar meaning)

"Arrest/Report on culprits". (user - several)

"I only have a role to follow the rules set by the VNRC and VC". (user)

"The only people who know about the MEMA project are the VNRC and VC. These are the ones attending MEMA meetings. No sub-village meetings have been held to inform people the meaning and benefits of MEMA". (user - and Maasai)

"I have no responsibility because I am not a member of MEMA, but if they announce that we have to participate in a certain activity, I will participate, e.g. to plant trees around water sources". (female user)

"I have no role. This is the responsibility of the committee (VNRC)". (female user)

"My involvement is restricted to listening to the directives of the committee (VNRC), and to follow these. I don't belong to the leadership". (young user)

"Why all these restrictions after the start of MEMA? In the old days we used to make canoes and sell them in the open, with the approval of the village government. Also, I don't understand when they say we should not expand our farms...". (canoe maker)

"The permit fees are too high and many cannot afford them. There are a number of people who have resorted to illegal harvests, which will lead to total depletion of the forests if nothing is done about the permit fees". (user)

4.3.2 Capacity Building and participation of the users in the planning and implementation process

Many users have participated in initial awareness raising regarding the importance of natural resources. They claim to have benefited from the increased awareness and are ready to take up their role and responsibilities accordingly. However, only few of the users' knowledge (and responses) go beyond the initial awareness raising activities and there have been problems in disseminating what is learnt to other users.

Also study tours were arranged for a few selected users involved in livestock keeping, fishing, and bee-keeping to places such as Babati and Shinyanga to study aspects such as community involvement in forest conservation, bee-

keeping and tree planting. Community leaders such as WEOs, councillors and village chairmen also joined the tours.

The different departments prepared the training programmes. For example, the Bee-keeping Department prepared training on how to make better hives, while the Forestry Department prepared training on establishment of nurseries, selection of seeds, sowing and transplanting. The awareness raising and capacity building has thereby become somewhat compartmentalised instead of integrating the promotion of message and techniques.

Apart from the above training activities to a few selected users most awareness raising regarding PFM Plans has taken place at general village assembly meetings rather than meetings at sub-village level. Therefore a considerable number of users have not participated and consequently have little knowledge about the PFM Plans. The often long distance between sub-villages and village and lack of timely information regarding project activities often prevent users in the sub-villages to participate. The Team has received several complaints from users who believe much information stays with the village leaders. Furthermore call for meetings (and seminars/training for VNRCs/VCS) in village and sub-villages are often communicated at a very short notice.

Despite the limited awareness raising activities the Team has found several sound successes at sub-village level of users being having formed active groups involved in raising of seedlings, tree planting, bee keeping, water sources' protection, and wild fire control. What the Team emphasises is the need for developing an approach that ensures the successes are multiplied in the sub-villages to a much larger extent than today.

As mentioned earlier, the Team is aware that the project activities and awareness raising tend to focus at the village level more than the sub-village level. The Team also recognises that the VNRC should be the PFM partner to ensure the involvement of users at the sub-village level with facilitation from the forester and possibly the Village Council. The Team is confident that the need to further inform and involve the users at sub-village level will be strengthened, as the success of the PFM Plans depends on an enforcement of information linking individual activities to the ambition of PFM planning.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"I have heard that some village leaders were sent on a study tour to Arusha on bee keeping, but they have not arranged any seminar to brief us on what they learnt. The training was for their own benefit". (user)

"Meetings are usually in Makuka village centre. Here in Nyamahato (sub-village) their (foresters) visits are mostly to survey and patrol". (user)

"MEMA staff were here at least three times. They visited the Village Council, but no public assembly meeting was held". (female user)

4.3.3 Expectations and motivation for participation

Those primary users that have been actively involved in the tree planting and bee keeping recognise that these activities to some extent will compensate for an income they used to obtain otherwise from the natural resources. Others in this category are more sceptical and e.g. expect the project to find a market for their honey; an issue the project is currently working on.

As mentioned earlier several primary users expect restrictions in their activities. They also expect the project to take initiatives to motivate their positive participation. It was mentioned by several of the users, who in the near future will face restrictions regarding the future of their agricultural practises that the project should introduce e.g. techniques on how to sustain cultivation without practising shifting cultivation and other expansion of agricultural land.

Other users faced with restrictions with regard to expansion of the residential area demanded that they would be informed well in advance should they have to be moved. A Maasai family living and farming inside the Kitapilimwa Forest Reserve has already received a directive to move (see Box Text 3). A few users in the same category expected that they would have to continue the activities facing irrespective of the PFM Plans. Some of these users asked for flexibility and if possible reconsideration of the restrictions.

Several informed users complained that the promoted activities (tree planting and bee keeping) either need own land and or an investment capital. Others pointed to the fact that a farmer is not allowed to plant trees on rented land. Land renting is practised in all project communities at increasing prices and with particular interest and consequences for those who do not have land - and those who wish to expand their agricultural activities to improve their livelihood.

The Team is also concerned with the particular issues surrounding decision making with regard to land tenure and ownership to privately owned "malungulu" land. Any PFM Plan involved with land use planning and restrictions regarding the usage of natural resources and restrictions on expansion on agricultural land in an area where much agricultural as well as woodland is perceived as "malungulu" land has to give this issue special attention. Attention towards this issue will also be necessary, as the "malungulu" land in some project villages where pressure on available agricultural land already exists. Inclusion of the "malungulu" woodlands often constitutes the youth's only possibility for making a livelihood in agriculture - a livelihood dominating most households in rural Iringa Districts²⁰. In other words, expansion into "malungulu" land provides a viable coping strategy to poverty alleviation. The Team wants to emphasise that if the "ujamaa" policy regarding access and ownership to land could not do away with "malungulu" land, there is no perspective for any PFM

²⁰ Interviews with Iringa District Council representatives showed that plans for developing the district are based on agriculture as it primary and most promising and economic activity and that a continued expansion of the district's economy will depend on inclusion of the woodlands in Iringa District.

Plan to overlook or by-pass the issue. The Team has seen no discussion on the "malungulu" issue in the PFM Plans.

Other users were looking for a more integrated approach to natural resources than "just trees and bee keeping". One informant with this view is living in Migoli, where the presence of the Mtera Lake and a thriving fish industry (and other developments in this fast growing community) depends on the natural resources in the woodland and the lake.

Nearly all women interviewed were expecting credit and that the project would create access to income generating activities - e.g. provide milking goats.

All users that were not informed and therefore not involved requested the project to inform them in order for them to participate! Especially women voiced this demand.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"It (MEMA) should ease restrictions regarding expansion of farmland. If people are allowed to expand their farmland, they will reduce going to the forest to make charcoal". (user)

"I get around 120 litres of honey per year. My income has improved". (female user)

"The project should get us a market for the honey". (female user)

"For us the priority is agriculture. We would appreciate training on better farming methods. We don't eat trees.." (user)

4.3.4 Gender - Youth perspectives - and poverty alleviation

Among users there are several unresolved gender - youth issues - and some are already mentioned earlier. Most important among these issues is the immediate need for women to be informed about PFM activities in the sub-villages to ensure their participation.

The Team also recognises the inter-linkage between women and poverty alleviation, when managing natural resources - and likewise the link between securing the youth's economic livelihood and sustained strategies to poverty alleviation in the rural areas. These issues are also well documented in the consultancy report "MEMA - Assessment of Gender Issues in Participatory Forest Management", Iringa, November 2001.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"I still don't understand the MEMA project, and therefore I can't tell if it is beneficial to me or not". (female user)

"Women should be given credit for income generation projects. The government should find ways of giving us permits for charcoal burning, fuelwood and timber harvesting for sale so that we can have a source of income from the natural resources". (female user)

4.3.5 Challenges, problems and concerns encountered with PFM

The most important challenges, problems and concerns raised by the users at community level have been integrated in the above sections. They include such issues as motivation for those who are involved in patrols and identification of market opportunities for honey. However, the Team has decided to give the project management an insight in the variation and magnitude of the different challenges, problems and concerns encountered by the users in the remarks below.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"I am worried about the market for honey". (user - several)

"Bee keeping cannot replace my pitsawing. Maasai only make brew on special occasions and the market is too small". (user)

"We have been told that this area is meant for wildlife and tree conservation. However, the village of Makuka faces land shortage. Fertility and abundant farmland brought us here (the sub-village, where farming in future will be restricted as a result of the PFM Plan". (user)

"Too much emphasis on trees. I suggest more attention on farming activities". (user)

"Shortage of land: tree planting takes up farmland". (user)

"Some people are forced to clear land to expand their farms. They don't like the MEMA restrictions". (user)

"I rent land and I am not allowed to plant trees on that land". (user)

"I have lack of capital to expand activities. Making beehives require timber, nails etc." (user)

"MEMA has caused serious poverty to me and my family - I have lost my occupation". (user)

"Because I was prevented from doing shifting cultivation, now we are getting a smaller harvest because of using the same plot of land for farming". (user)

"There has been no proper sensitisation and awareness raising regarding MEMA and therefore many people hesitate to participate". (female user)

"The Maasai don't attend meetings at sub-village or village level and therefore no MEMA information has reached that group. Secondly, Maasai don't take messages and information from third party, wherefore they will need more direct attention from the MEMA management". (user and VNRC member)

"The illegal burning of charcoal is related to the market in Iringa". (user)

"(ownership) MEMA is ours. MEMA encourages proper utilisation of forests for us and our children". (user)

"(ownership) MEMA belongs to the Government - because if I temper with the forest it is the Village Council, which will catch and punish me". (user)

"(ownership) MEMA is ours because we are the users of the resources". (user - several)

"(ownership) The forest belongs to "Maliasili" (Nat. Res. Dept.). They are the ones giving instructions about how to use it". (user)

4.3.6 Suggested improvements to PFM

The users suggested a number of improvements to PFM, including the need to re-think the fees and permit system and other improvements to PFM some of which have been included in Chapter 5, Recommendation. Yet, the Team allows more voices to be heard to substantiate and validate the situational analysis - and to give the project management an opportunity to hear the various and often viable suggestions made by different users.

Remarks from beneficiaries:

"We need information about a market for honey". (user)

"Restrictions should be reduced to enable us to prosper". (user)

"Awareness raising to all the villagers and users in the sub-villages regarding the importance of the forest and our responsibilities". (user)

"The permit fees are too high and many users cannot afford them. There are a number of people who have resorted to illegal harvests, which would lead to total depletion of forests unless something is done about fees/permits". (user)

"Project activities should be brought closer to the people - seminars, demonstrations etc. Bring them to the sub-village". (user)

"Chances of their (VNRC) patrols to succeed is slim - people have to make a living". (user)

"The VC and the VNRC should be more responsible to the people by letting the villagers know what is taking place in the village by arranging frequent village assemblies". (user)

"I have no idea what could improve the project. There is a shortage of farmland". (user)

5 Recommendations

The Team is aware that the project is about to start implementation of the PFM Plans in the five zones covering the project area. In order not to delay the process of implementation, the Team has decided to include recommendations at two levels. The two levels are:

- ? recommendations for immediate action, and
- ? recommendations for continuation of activities

5.1 Recommendations for Immediate Action and Adjustments

1. VNRC workplan - improvement of participation and transparency

To ensure that the important work of the VNRC includes the participation of more users and to ensure that the work of the VNRC includes more positive tasks than patrols, a workplan for each VNRC has to be developed immediately. The workplan should emphasise "what, when, how, who, and why" prioritised duties to be implemented immediately and within the next (six/three) months (dry season):

- 1) An immediate task will be to ensure that the management of the VNRC organises and facilitates a comprehensive meeting scrutinising the draft PFM Plan to discuss and inform members of the VNRC with regard to their - and users - roles, responsibilities and rights vis-à-vis the PFM Plan.
- 2) A plan for a comprehensive meeting in each sub-village with the purpose of informing all primary users (and ensuring that particularly women attend) regarding their role, responsibilities and rights regarding the PFM Plans. Each sub-village meeting should be hosted by the particular sub-village VNRC member and facilitated by either the secretary or the chairman of the VNRC.
- 3) The forester responsible should closely monitor that the above mentioned activities take place, and to the extent possible facilitate activities of the "weaker" VNRCs.

The success of involving women in the above activities is crucial for the development of a future more comprehensive and poverty sensitive gender - youth approach.

2. Change from awareness raising/attitude training approach to a management approach

The Team is aware that the PFM Plans are about to be completed and another phase in the implementation of the PFM starts - implementation. The project should therefore move from awareness raising and attitude training to a much more management oriented approach of how to plan, demonstrate, utilise and implement all the acquired awareness.

However, before management and demonstrations can be added to awareness raising there is still especially in sub-villages and among women a crucial need for awareness raising. A substantial number of residents in sub-villages are not yet informed - or informed to a level where the process of progressing awareness raising to demonstrations and management is possible. As a result the project will for some time have to work on a double-stringed approach of awareness raising in some places and among some user groups, while at the same time taking the informed users further into planning, demonstrations and management. This recommendation is closely linked with the recommendation regarding workplans.

3. Member and training roster of VNRC and VC

With the high turnover of VNRC members there is a need to establish and maintain a member-training-rooster, for the forester and management to know at any time who has been trained in what. The forester will then be able to follow to what extent he might have to arrange refresher training and reduce repetitive training of the same VNRC/VC members. The VNRC/VC will facilitate and motivate those members that have not yet been trained and who in numerous interviews with the Team have demanded to be included in future training. This is not to say that every time a new member join a VNRC there is a need for more training. The Team has already stressed the need for the VNRC to take full responsibility for internal information sharing. The VNRC should be encouraged to welcome new members with a comprehensive orientation. The Team has the impression that the turnover of elected members of the VC is less frequent. Still, the roster should also include VC members.

4. Patrols and payment

The project should in co-operation with the VCs and the VNRC develop an allowance system to take care of the problem of motivation and authority for continued patrols. The Team has been informed that training of "forest guards" is underway. The Team welcomes the separation of patrols from other duties of the VNRC, as it will give them precious time and possibilities for advancing their many other tasks. The allowance system should accommodate "forests guards" as well, if these are the future patrollers of the forest.

5. Adjustments to fees/permit system

Fees that only facilitate protection and not the livelihood and economic activities of primary users should be reconsidered - lowered. Fees/permits should also be included addressing secondary users in order to have a more balanced cost share regarding fees/permits - and also to raise awareness and responsibility regarding the inter-linkage between primary and secondary users and the sustainable and economic usage of natural resources. Fees that are formulated as "per trip/item" should be reconsidered to be based on a "realistic time period" instead - to make the whole system user-friendly and administratively possible for the VNRC/VC. This recommendation will also assist to ensure that natural resources products are not illegally harvested in the woodland/forest and then somehow "whitewashed" as soon as the products arrive at the secondary users' workshops and other business venues. The recommendations will finally encourage the VNRC/VC to adhere to and utilise the fee/permit system - instead of the possibility of ignoring certain practises because of a poverty alleviation concern - or other concerns.

6. More (than) trees and honey - a need for other (innovative) activities

The Team has throughout its Beneficiary Assessment been met with much appreciation of the tree planting, bee keeping, fire control, and improved stove activities introduced by the project. The Team has also been met with worries about whether a market for honey exists, persistent low prices on wood products, and a request for "the experts" to identify other activities for users who do not envisage tree planting and bee keeping as a particularly viable activity. In other words, the experts have to listen to suggestions from the users and together identify other income-generating activities and innovations for sustainable usage of the natural resources. The Team and the users suggest the following activities to be discussed and tested:

- ? Discuss and test incentives to make participation in patrols attractive and voluntary. Many Village Councils are fighting hard to collect annual Development Levy, and at the time of the Socio-economic Baseline Study the percentage collected was often below 50 per cent of the possible total. Perhaps some men/women would rather patrol to "pay" Development Levy: 10 patrols per year and you are exempted from Development Levy? Or "Forest Guards" could through their patrols be exempted from payment of Development Levy?
- ? "For us the priority is agriculture. We would appreciate training on better farming methods - now when we can't expand our farmland. We don't eat trees. In places like Itula, villagers have been trained to cultivate "okoa" sorghum, which is very productive". (user)
- ? A small untreated/unpainted fishing canoe on the Mtera Lake lasts only 2 -3 years - how long time does a treated/painted boat last? The idea should be tested. A possibility exists that treatment of boats could save far more trees in the woodland than fees and permits?
- ? The idea of fuel saving stoves is fine, but techniques also exist to save fuelwood when e.g. burning bricks and smoking fish. Moreover, fish smokers

are in other places self-supplied with wood from their own woodlots. The fish smokers and brick makers should be targeted as user group with a special interest - and responsibility as their activities are particularly dependent on the natural resources.

- ? The Team also suggests study tours to markets in Iringa and other places for the honey producers, where they themselves can confirm or not, whether a market exists for their honey. This could also provide an opportunity for establishing links directly with the buyers instead of middlemen/middlewomen. Moreover, it will let the producers know the actual market price of their products.
- ? The Team has noticed that lorries come from Dar Es Salaam to outlying areas in the Udzungwa Mountains and the woodland areas to buy timber, charcoal, green maize, tomatoes and potatoes. Are they interested in buying honey - or other products from the forest/woodland? Enquiries should be made.

7. "Malungulu" land

The project should take cognisance of the implications of "malungulu" land rights and how these differ in the various project areas. Owners of "malungulu" land should be sensitised and - if demand occurs - co-opted by advising them about how they can best benefit economically from their land. The Team is aware that the project has already started to advise villagers in tree management techniques such as pruning. These efforts could be extended to include aspects such as inter-cropping of perennial and annual crops on "malungulu" land.

5.2 Recommendations for Continuation of Activities

8. Formulation and mainstreaming of a gender - youth approach

The previous immediate recommendations will all pave the way and be crucial for the development of a comprehensive and mainstreamed gender - youth approach with a poverty focus. The Team believes that the staff with careful facilitation will be in the best position to develop the envisaged gender - youth approach, based on the findings of the Team and findings presented and analysed in the consultancy report "MEMA - Assessment of Gender Issues in Participatory Management", Iringa, November 2001 - and the experiences following the implementation of VNRC workplan.

9. Rethinking and mainstreaming fees/permit system

It should be discussed and tested whether a more simple "natural resources fee" could be added to the already existing Development Levy of the Village Government to minimise part of or the entire complicated and time consuming fees/permit system at the community level. The fee should be based on a flat rate and used for e.g. allowances for patrols guards and other communal natural resources activities.