

# **East Usambara Catchment Forest Project**

## **WORKING PAPER 3**

### **PROCEEDINGS OF THE EUCFP PHASE II PROJECT DOCUMENT REVIEW WORKSHOP**

**MKONGE HOTEL, 25 AUGUST 1994**

**S.G. JOHANSSON (Ed.)**

**Ministry of Tourism, Natural Resources and  
Environment, Tanzania  
Forestry and Beekeeping Division**

**Department of International Development  
Co-operation, Finland  
Finnish Forest and Park Service**

**Tanga 1995**

---

<b>Table of contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>Phase II of the EUCFP - A participatory planning process</b> S.E. Mmasi, Assistant Deputy Project Manager, EUCFP	1
<b>Review of Phase I of EUCFP and the need for and target groups in Phase II</b> C.T. Sawe, Ag. Deputy Project Manager, EUCFP M.S. Kijazi, Monitoring In-Charge, EUCFP	5
<b>EUCFP Phase II objectives and components</b> M.J.N. Wambura, Enforcement & Extension In-Charge, EUCFP	11
<b>Phase II strategies and their implications</b> M.I.L. Katigula, Project Manager, EUCFP	14
<b>Phase II inputs and resources</b> L.E. Mshana, Ag. Survey & Mapping In-Charge, EUCFP	19
<b>Recommendations of the Senior Forest Officers Review Team</b> L. Nshubemuki, TAFORI	22
<b>Terms of Reference for the EUCFP Appraisal Mission</b> A. Rytönen, Team Leader, GOF/GOT Appraisal Team	24
<b>Appendices</b>	
List of participants	26
Workshop programme	27

## **PHASE II OF THE EAST USAMBARA CATCHMENT FOREST PROJECT – A PARTICIPATORY PLANNING PROCESS**

**Stephen E. Mmasi**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The Planning of the Phase II of the East Usambara Catchment Forest Project (EUCFP) was initiated in the Steering Committee meeting on 17 November 1993. The planning process for the Phase II Project document started in late February 1994 by forming a Project Design Team consisting of six members who have been involved in the planning work up to date. The Design Team members were selected from the project staff and incurred following members:

Mr. Masaba I.L. Katigula, Project Manager  
Ms. Mwanaidi S. Kijazi, Ecological Monitoring and Research In-Charge  
Mr. Stephen E. Mmasi, Assistant Deputy Project Manager  
Ms. Luciana E. Mshana, Acting Survey and Mapping In-Charge  
Mr. Corodius T. Sawe, Acting Deputy Project Manager  
Mr. Matiko J.N. Wambura, Enforcement and Extension Coordination Unit In-Charge

A participatory planning process was adopted for preparing the project document with the aim of involving the different target group from the project area representing local, national and international interests in the project area.

The participatory planning process had two major objectives:

1. To ensure that the project formulation reflects local needs and conditions, and to build local commitment to implementation of the plan developed; and
2. Human resources and institutional development for members of the project staff and others involved in the planning process.

### **PARTICIPATORY PLANNING**

In February—March 1994, the Design Team members underwent initial training before embarking on the planning work. Training was provided by the Planning Facilitator and the Chief Technical Adviser of the project. In mid-March the project invited project staff from the Zanzibar Forestry Development Project who had worked on a similar planning exercise in 1992. The purpose was to share experience from the planning process. Training was also provided to acquaint the Design Team members and others involved in the planning on how to start and to proceed with the work in an efficient way by using the Logical Framework Approach. The Design Team started by discussions on core problems, project components and Terms of References (TOR) for the preparation of Phase II Project document.

In the discussion process, the TOR was prepared which lead the Design Team to start working on the draft of the Phase II project document. The TOR was submitted to the respective governments for comments on 23 March 1993. The TOR was discussed and approved with amendments by the EUCFP Steering Committee meeting on 31 May, and approved by FBD on 13 June 1994.

In the process of writing the draft document the Design Team members decided to assign each individual to write his/her section in the document. These were later discussed, agreed and merged into the document..

## **DATA COLLECTION**

The preparation of the draft document required various kinds of information and data collection was quite necessary. Data and information needed was obtained through workshops, meetings, normal consultations and discussions as follows:

### **Workshops**

1. EUCFP Project Staff Workshop, Tanga Municipal Conference Hall, Tanga, 8 April 1994, 48 participants.
2. Villager Workshop (for villagers from 25 villages surrounding East Usambara Forest Reserves), Ambassador Hotel, Muheza, 28 April, 98 participants.
3. Workshop for Heads of Institutions, Politicians, and Administrators, Panori Motel, Tanga 20 April 1994, 40 participants.
4. Tanga Municipality and Muheza District Foresters Workshop, Tanga Municipal Hall, 27 May 1994, 40 participants.
5. Workshop with Staff Members from East Usambara Conservation and Agricultural Development Project, EUCFP Conference Room, Tanga, 16 June 1994, 9 participants.
6. Planning Feedback Workshop (with villager, staff, and institutional representatives), Panori Motel, 8 July 1994, 18 participants.

### **Contacts and meetings**

Meetings were held with people working in the Regional Development Director's Office (e.g. Regional Water Engineer, Regional Planning Officer, Regional Forest Officer, Adult Education Officer, and Regional Community Development Officer). Other contacts were in the Tanga Municipality, and the District Administration in Muheza and Korogwe, especially those concerned with natural resources issues. Meetings were also held with villagers and their representatives (e.g. Ward Secretaries). Discussions were also held with other institutions, projects and private enterprises such as the Tanzania Forest Research Institute (TAFORI), East Usambara Conservation and Agricultural Development Project, East Usambara Tea Company Ltd/Karimjee Agriculture Ltd, Kauzeni Sisal Processing Factory.

Additional meetings were held in Dar es Salaam with the senior staff at the Forestry and Beekeeping Division, Directorate of Meteorology, and the Embassy of Finland.

Other sources of information obtained through reports and literature in the office and other institutions. Other sources of information were discussion with individuals. Having compiled all the types of information needed, the Design Team drafted the background analysis between April and May, and the main document in June and July. The Background Analyses were the following:

Problem Analysis	Design Team
Technical analysis	Matiko Wambura
Socio-economic and cultural analysis	Luciana Mshana
Gender analysis	Mwanaidi Kijazi
Economic and Financial analysis	Corodius Sawe
Institutional analysis	Masaba Katigula
Environmental analysis	Stephen Mmasi
Risk analysis	Masaba Katigula

## COMPLETING THE DRAFT DOCUMENT

In late July and early August the Background Analysis and the main document were reviewed and edited in the process of finalising the work on the draft document.

On 28th July, 1994, the Rough First Draft of the main text was complete. The Design Team members and the facilitators reviewed the rough draft. The Design Team continued working on it; correcting, adding necessary missing information and deleting unnecessary information.

In the process the editing of the Background Analysis and other annexes was going hand in hand with the editing of the main text. The First Draft of the main document (Volume I) and the Annexes (Volume II) were produced on 7th August, 1994 ready to be reviewed by the Senior Forest Officers Team appointed by the FBD and the FINNIDA Appraisal Team.

## SOME LESSONS

The planning exercise was quite useful to the Design Team members. It developed further their existing skill to work with villagers and other institutions, which contribute to a more participatory approach to management. It is even more beneficial for the future work to be done by the Project to increase the local involvement in management of the forests in the East Usambaras in a more sustainable and participatory manner.

The Planning work has helped the project staff to understand project design. Planning was quite useful to the Design Team members and typists since they have also acquire more knowledge about the use of computer programmes and computer facilities. On the other hand, the work was tough and time consuming to the extent that the project work plan was not properly followed and supervised. This is because the Design Team members are implementors of some of the project activities.

### Discussion:

(S. Mbwana) How did the Design Team involve the villagers? Mr. Mmasi elaborated on the workshop for villagers and on the criteria for inviting specific villagers and villages.

(V. Holmgren) How did the villagers react to the process how well did they participate, what was their response? Mr. Sawe elaborated and detailed the criteria for selecting villagers. There were no uniform reactions. Most were interested in conservation, they were concerned with forest needs, fuelwood, medicine. (Katigula) Villagers were content to be involved. There were immediate responses, village chairmen reported illegalities. (Mshana) Pointed out the

---

amount of available information. (Johansson) Pointed at the extension study and the feed-back workshop.

(Mayawalla) How many women participated in the workshops? (Mshana) At least one third participated, most very actively.

(Kamuzora) What was the role of the sisal estates, how were they involved? (Sawe) Those which were close to the F.R., e.g. Mnuyzy F.R. on the Korogwe side. They were invited in the workshops. Planting of trees within the estates were discussed. (Katigula) Discussion regarding encroachment was discussed in Potwe. Results are encouraging. (Kamuzora) Did the DT consider the labourers in the sisal estates.

(Kinni) Requires a lot of time takes a lot from the other work. Can the DT be released from the duties. What can we learn. (Mmasi) The DT should be released. (Johansson) Pointed at the experience and difficulties about this type of planning. An account will be made when the work is completed, elaborating of the advantages and disadvantages as well as recommendations for improving such planning approaches.

## **REVIEW OF PHASE I OF EAST USAMBARA CATCHMENT FOREST PROJECT AND THE NEED FOR AND TARGET GROUPS IN PHASE II.**

**Corodius T. Sawe & Mwanaidi S. Kijazi**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The East Usambara Catchment Forest Project (EUCFP) was initiated by the Government of Tanzania in collaboration with Government of Finland. It was based on the proposals put forward by the Amani Forest Inventory and Management Planning Project (AFIMP) and the Tanzania Forestry Action Plan (TFAP). Organisationally, the project is under the Forestry and Beekeeping Division (FBD) of the Ministry of Tourism Natural Resource and Environment (MTNRE). AFIMP confirmed that East Usambara is rich in biodiversity and catchment values. The high degree of endemism of flora and fauna are among factors which influenced the proposal for the establishment of the Amani Nature Reserve. AFIMP recommended the development of a proper management plan that will take into consideration the conservation of catchments and biodiversity in the East Usambara mountains in Tanga Region.

### **OBJECTIVES OF PHASE I**

Phase I of the EUCFP was initiated in and runs through 1994. The development objectives were:

1. To maintain the essential ecological processes and life support systems in the East Usambaras supporting the population in rural and urban areas of the Tanga Region, and to preserve genetic resources for the benefit of the future; and
2. To ensure that the utilization of the forests related resources is rational and sustainable.

The immediate objectives of the Phase I were:

1. The establishment and management of the Amani Nature Reserve or preserving its biological diversity;
2. The establishment of sustained catchment forestry practices for watershed management and utilization of forest related resources;
3. To develop effective management of plantation forests for wood use reducing pressure on natural forest and as a buffer zone against the reserved natural forests;
4. To improve the capacity of the FBD to plan and manage natural forests for multiple purposes.

### **ACHIEVEMENTS IN PHASE I**

#### **Nature Conservation**

The idea of establishing Amani Nature Reserve was introduced in the villages and institutions within the Amani area. The project Steering Committee supported the idea and the establishment of the Amani Nature Reserve Advisory Board. A legal consultancy was commissioned by the project to look at feasible management systems that could be adopted in management of Amani Nature Reserve.

The EUCFP and the East Usambara Tea Company Ltd and Karimjee Agriculture Ltd entered a tentative agreement aiming at a Forest Dedication Covenant as a initial step of including the forests under their lease into the Amani Nature Reserve. A Frame Plan for Amani Nature Reserve was prepared as a guideline for the preparation of a Management Plan.

Some rehabilitation work at Amani Botanical Garden was initiated in collaboration with Tanzania Forestry Research Institute (TAFORI). Amani Nature Reserve head quarters was proposed at Kisiwani at the entrance to the Amani Botanical Garden. A rehabilitation plan was prepared. Preparations for the development of the site, including shifting of Kisiwani Primary School to the village nearby was completed.

The initial steps for the gazettment of Amani Nature Reserve, including conducting meetings and boundary surveys, was completed.

### **Catchment Forestry**

The project aimed to gazette Kambai, Nilo, Mlinga, and Mtai Forest Reserves. It also aimed at combining Bamba, Segoma and Kwamgumi Forest Reserves into one manageable F.R. The following achievement were made:

Kambai	1,046 ha	Government notice remaining
Mlinga	840 ha	Government notice remaining.
Mtai	3,107 ha	Survey work completed.
Nilo	5,872 ha	Survey work completed.

The illegal activities in forest reserves were contained through increased forest patrolling and by involving local communities in forest protection. Follow-up of field activities and monitoring improved work performance to a great extent. All forest boundaries have been opened at a total of 476 km of border length, 394 km was marked by tree planting. Enrichment planting have been done in more than 80 ha of gaps open space in the forest reserves.

Preparation of management plans for all forest reserves of East Usambara was one of the Phase I objectives. Two draft plans have been prepared. They are currently being reviewed and modified for approval and implementation. The project also produced land use maps for the East Usambara, particularly to assist in the management planning.

### **Plantation Forestry**

The project supported the Longuza Teak Project until the end of June 1994. The project Mid-term Review team did not, however, find the support justified and recommended that the support should be discontinued. A management plan was prepared for Longuza Teak Plantation.



## **Institutional Support**

The project improved the institutional capacity to manage the forest through staff motivation and training. The project has upgraded the forest stations and presently a new office is about to be completed in Tanga. Little was achieved in research activities.

## **LESSONS OF PHASE I**

A major issue to consider now is whether the Amani Nature Reserve together with any other Nature Reserve to be established in Tanzania can be accommodated within forestry legislation and in relation to other existing legislation for protected areas, national parks and game reserves. The factor of sustainable management of protected areas should be considered during selection of feasible alternative to be used.

Interactions and involvement of local communities in forest conservation is very important particularly where there is enlargement of existing forest reserve or establishment of new ones. For that reason is also important to collaborate with other projects, institutions, districts and regional authorities.

Project should develop community planning management system whereby benefits to local communities can be incorporated, and at the same time to come into compromise on the restrictions and control that can be adopted in the forest reserve.

Raising peoples awareness in conservation and the potential of forest reserves has been seen as one way of improving forest conservation in East Usambara. The knowledge of the importance of the forests to local communities results in less destruction of the forest. On the other hand, by advertising the potential of the reserves may attract tourists and hence revenue generation.

The chain of command from the forest Division to the Project is quite clear. However, the interaction of the Project and the Regional and District Natural Resource Offices together with decision makers of the Regional and District level should further be improved.

## **JUSTIFICATION**

The East Usambara forests are considered among the most important conservation priorities in Africa due to presence of high biological diversity and high endemism of flora and fauna.

At the national and local levels these forests constitute the watershed for the Sigi River which is the main source of water for Tanga Municipality. On the local level the forests have protective function together with supply of basic needs such as building poles, fuelwood, water and other things of substantial economic values. In some areas of these forest reserves there are cultural, ritual, and social values to the local communities. The increase in population in East Usambara area and high demand of forests and forest products utilization is a major threat of these forests with considerable local, national, and global importance. This situation calls for a firm management system. Important activities, such as strengthening and streamlining of the legal and institutional framework for the Amani Nature Reserve still require considerable attention in Phase II.

Considering some of these long-term challenges and the significance and unique values of the East Usambara Forests, the EUCFP Midterm Review Mission (1993) considered that a total of 10-15 years of external support may be needed.

The East Usambara Mountains have been priority conservation areas in the Tanzania Forestry Action Plan, 1990/91 - 2007/08 (TFAP), which is the overall framework guiding forest conservation and sustainable utilization of forest resources. The project is trying to fulfil conservation of biological diversity and sustained management of natural forest ecosystems for multiple uses as emphasised in the draft National Environmental Policy.

Sustainable management of the forests in the East Usambaras will promote and maintain protection of the biological diversity from which the entire global community can benefit. Moreover, the local communities will be assured of important forestry benefits, such as provision of medicinal plants, worshipping sites, water for domestic use and small-scale irrigation of cash and food crops. The population in Tanga and Muheza will be supplied with adequate and clean water for both domestic and industrial use.

Improved microclimatic condition will maintain the agricultural performance in tea, cocoa, and sisal production and related processing industries. The forests' contribution to the commercial sector, both in agriculture and manufacturing industries, will contribute to the national economy, through increase employment opportunities and exports.

## **TARGET GROUPS**

The unique ecological values of the forests in East Usambara Mountains makes many people interested in the sustainable conservation and management of these forests. The “stake holders” includes local, regional, national and international interests. Therefore, the conservation and sustainable use of these forest resources will benefit various target groups, and in Phase II of the project, target groups identified includes primary, secondary group and other beneficiaries.

### **The Primary Target Group**

This includes the rural people who live adjacent to the forest reserves where the Project is working, together with the Tanga water consumers.

The 54 villages/rural communities (with an estimated 113,400 inhabitants) who live adjacent to forest reserve where the project is working, will benefit from the involvement of initial project activities and employment in form of casual labour also in supply of fuelwood, other forest products, water supplies and improvement in local condition. The project will work with five pilot villages in its farm forestry programme and four pilot villages for participatory management of Mpanga Forest for catchment purposes. Also efforts of working with women and men engaged in subsistence activities, schools and other local groups will be made by the project staff.

The Tanga water consumers (Tanga town with an estimated 210,000 inhabitants and its surroundings) will benefit from well maintained water sources with assurance of adequate supplies and improved water quality and quality for domestic use, agriculture and rapid growing industries such as sisal.

## **The Secondary Target Group**

The local forestry administration working in Tanga which includes, the Tanga Regional Catchment Forestry office (in which the East Usambara Catchment Forest Project works) under Forestry and Beekeeping Division, other foresters working in the Tanga Regional Development Director's office and District Executive Directors' offices in Muheza and Korogwe. Such benefits ranges from working gear, transport and training opportunities to be able to more effectively manage and conserve of the forest reserves in collaboration with local population.

The nation will benefit economically from the forest in activities such as ecotourism. The global community interested in biodiversity will appreciate the fulfilled goal of well protected and maintained ecosystem and genetic resources for future generation.

## **Other beneficiaries**

Other beneficiaries includes individuals and organizations. These are local product users which will benefit through sustainable supplies of the product. The research Institutions will benefit from continuation of long-established research traditions which will facilitate studies in ecology, hydrology, meteorology and relevant social-economic studies.

## **Discussion:**

(Mbwana) Phase I cleaned 467 km, why is it proposed that in Phase II more than 1,000 km will be completed. In Vol. II border planting/opening are mentioned, are these old or new reserves. (Sawe) Forest reserves are being enlarged and some new ones created, this is the reason for the target. Border planting is up to 80% in those already reserved or in those which are in the process of gazettelement.

(Msanga) The target groups will benefit in the long-term in the short term people are affected by enlargement. What strategies or alternatives does the project provide. There may also be other looser, e.g. timber merchants such as Sikh Sawmills. What actions are proposed.

(Kijazi) People are compensated for crops. The timber merchants are not entirely losers. The local timber users are taken into account. However, the big ones may have to change their supply distribution. (Sawe) Farm forestry was included in order to reduce the problems for the farmers who loose their land, done in collaboration with other extension institutions. For the big timber users awareness is raised on alternative raw material sources.

(Kiama) What measures have been take to control forest illegalities. The forest legislation is outdated, What is the projects strategy on this. (Sawe) Transport and mobility has been improved (2 motorbikes and tractor per station). The enforcement units have been incorporating even local communities. Extension activities and the preparation of an extension programme raised awareness. Most pitsayers come from outside the local communities. The new FO proposal is updated and includes new aspects such as nature reserves and nature conservation.

(Kamuzora) A management plan has been prepared? Is it used? Will it help the management? Why no research? Collaboration is only tentative, no concrete proposals. What about regional and district authorities. Target groups, is the project working towards efficient provision of forest products. (Kijazi) Commitment to target groups. These have been outlined in the farm

forestry component. The project works with specific villages (9 pilot villages and 54 local communities). These were selected according to specific criteria based on the Phase I experience. (Sawe) Much more has been done on Longuza apart from the management plan. The research package was not clear with no clear priorities. This was primary reason for little implementation. There has been collaboration with the communities. There are other institutions for other areas such as population control and stoves etc. Collaboration with other project such as EUCADP. (Johansson) Requested the discussion to be directed towards the issues in the Phase II proposal

The chairman requested the EUCADP representatives, who arrived 11 am, to present themselves (Enhardt, Kimaro).

## **EUCFP PHASE II OBJECTIVES AND COMPONENTS**

**Matiko J.N. Wambura**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The projects Design Team after going through the components proposed by the mid-term review mission, ideas from different sources, experience from Phase I and considering the project needs, and after analyzing the problems and identifying the core problem of the project, came out with the following objectives:

### **DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE**

The development objective of the Phase II is:

To achieve and maintain effective conservation of forests and their sustainable utilization to ensure preservation of biological diversity and catchment values in the East Usambara.

The projects immediate objective and their respective components are:

1. Establish management of Amani Nature to promote biological diversity preservation;
2. Catchment forestry practices improved and maintained to manage watershed areas efficiently;
3. Establishment of farm forestry for soil conservation and to provide forest produce to local communities as alternatives to reduce pressure on natural forests;
4. Improved institutional capacity to plan and manage forests on sustainable basis through multisectoral approaches; and
5. Strengthen ecological information gathering and research on forest eco-systems.

In order to achieve the above objectives, the project is structured into five components.

### **NATURE CONSERVATION**

Which primarily will be dealing with:

- The legal establishment of Amani Nature Reserve;
- Adoption and implementation of nature reserve management approach;
- Renovation and up keep of the Amani Botanical Garden;
- Possibilities of shifting Amani Medical Research Centre from Amani to Muheza; and
- Improvement on environmental information and training.

### **CATCHMENT FORESTRY**

Which primarily deals with:

- Effective control of forest destruction;

- Improvement of forest reserve vegetation cover;
- Maintenance of forest reserves boundaries;
- Preparation of forest reserve management plans;
- Gazettement of new forest reserves (Semdoe, Derema, Mgambo and Mlungui and enlargement for existing forest reserve (e.g. Marimba);
- Establishment of Mpanga Catchment forest management by involving villagers on pilot basis; and
- Production of adequate quality and quantity of tree seedlings.

## **FARM FORESTRY**

Which primarily deals with:

- Establishment of individual, village and school tree nurseries in five pilot villages;
- Establishment of ecological sound agroforestry practices in five villages;
- Supporting to women in forestry and agroforestry issue in 5 pilot villages; and
- Conduct awareness raising campaign on agroforestry and conservation for villagers.

## **INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT**

- To improve project structure;
- Formulate Project's training programme;
- Motivate the Project Staff;
- Improve offices, accommodation and provision of equipment;
- Strengthen cooperation with relevant institutions and other sectors;
- Prepare and disseminate publicity materials; and
- Give proposals for long term sustainability of the Project.

## **RESEARCH AND ECOLOGICAL MONITORING**

Which primarily will deal with:

- Establishment of a data bank for ecological monitoring and other management systems; and
- Implementation of the prepared relevant research strategies.

### **Discussion:**

(Kiama) Staff (workers) motivation, what does this mean in Phase II. (Wambura) Training, improvement of accomodation, improvement of transport facilities.

(Kamuzora) Institutional collaboration, what does this explicitly mean in Phase II. (Katigula) It is two sided. There are concrete proposals for collaboration e.g. with the EUCADP. There is clear commitment. There is a pilot case on collaboration with the villagers in Mpanga Forest conservation. The establishment of the ANR has developed strong ties with the tea estates with concrete issues such as the covenant agreement, (Kamuzora) What about the NIMR relocation. (Katigula) Preliminary informal discussions have been held with parties concerned. Others such as GEF has been contacted. A memorandum of justification is to be prepared. (Johansson) Elaborated on the NMRI. Pointed out that the proposal does not aim at complete

relocation within a short time. The process requires careful discussions and would probably be a long-term gradual exercise.

(Holmgren) Farm Forestry. What does the public awareness campaign actually mean in Phase II. (Wambura) Discussing environmental conservation, providing seedlings, collaborating with other institutions such EUCADP and Kilimo. Exchange visits e.g. to SECAP and other areas where work has been developed.

## **EUCFP PHASE II STRATEGIES AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS**

**Masaba I.L. Katigula**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Attainment of the project development goal will largely depend on the approaches or methods of the project to reach the stated objectives and outputs. In other words key factors of the implementation path of the project major activities should be identified properly to make it easier for the project to achieve long term objectives and make it sustainable.

### **LONG-TERM STRATEGY**

The Project aims at achieving and maintaining effective conservation of forests and ensuring their sustainable utilization. Key factors are to preserve biological and catchment values in the East Usambaras.

In the current economic situation in Tanzania donor support to conservation seems to be inescapable. However, conservation may be unrealistic in the future if based upon continued dependence on external support only.

The long-term strategy for the implementation of Phase II EUCFP is made up of the following issues which will lead to effective conservation and utilization of the forests on sustainable basis.

#### **Policy and legislation**

Present policies and regulations will be studied and appropriate proposals made on. Revenue generation and retention schemes, management of strictly protected areas etc. The idea for instance of spending cash from water and electricity sales to manage watershed areas is one example. Promotion of eco-tourism by efficient management of the Amani Nature Reserve.

Amalgamation and whenever possible joining by corridors small individual forest reserves into larger blocks to minimize ecological effects of forest fragmentation.

Exploration on future possibilities to involve local communities in environmental conservation and increased collaboration with other related institutions especially in the project area.

Focus on cost-effective implementation of operations through testing alternatives e.g. maintenance of borders, firelines, regeneration techniques etc.

A general long term strategy by the Project would be to provide new information and experience through piloting approaches and research.



---

## **SPECIFIC STRATEGIES**

### **Nature Conservation**

Management of the Amani Nature Reserve will promote conservation of biological diversity. Important strategies includes:

- Proposal on legal issues in order to manage the Nature Reserve to required standards
- Justification of investment in conservation and thereby initiating revenue generating activities such as eco-tourism.
- Focus on information and public relations to make the Nature Reserve uniqueness known.
- Consideration on mechanisms on how surrounding communities, other land users e.g. Tea Estates could be involved in the management of the Nature Reserve.
- Buffer zoning to consider the forest based needs of surrounding communities.
- Initiatives to shift the National Institute for Medical Research Centre at Amani to Muheza.

### **Catchment Forestry**

Long term sustainability of managing the Catchment Forests in the East Usambaras continues to be a core issue of the project. Major strategies will include the following:

- To consider possibilities for involving local communities in the conservation of the forests through pilot cases.
- To manage the forests through a zoning approach to achieve multiple functions of the forests such as biodiversity conservation, protection of catchment values and production zones.
- Trials on various methods on vegetation rehabilitation and forests reserve boundary establishment and maintenance to reduce high costs involved in the operations.
- To increase presence of project staff in the forest reserves through patrolling by establishing beats or forest substations closer to the forests.

### **Farm Forestry**

During Phase I pressure on forests originate from the surrounding communities through tree cutting and agricultural encroachment. The need to assist the rural communities in tree planting in order to meet their daily wood needs is given emphasis in Phase II.

Success of the Farm Forestry activities will be guided by the following strategies:

- Assist villagers in tree raising, planting and developing agroforestry. This will be done in selected pilot villagers.
- Increased extension programmes with focus on contact farmers, schools and other social groups in the project area.
- Increased collaboration with related projects such as EUCADP and other institutions such as agricultural department especially at the field level on extension activities.

## **Institutional Support**

The project focuses on increased capacity of the FBD staff to sustain conservation and forest management in the East Usambaras. Strategies to achieve the objectives include the following:

- To have a comprehensive staff training programme which will focus on defined project needs.
- Provision of necessary facilities and ensure their contribution to reach the project long term objectives.
- Emphasis on collaboration with other sectors and institutions to better use of inputs and resources.

## **Research and Ecological Monitoring**

Relevant research and monitoring will increase flexibility and improve the management of the East Usambara forests. The project impacts will be identified and hence justification made clear. Strategies on research and ecological monitoring will be guided by the following factors:

- The use of the TAFORI Research Masterplan in designing research alternatives.
- Identification of priority research needs and areas, related to the project existing problems. This would include developing low cost methods of rehabilitating forest areas etc.
- Establishment of a computer data base for ecological monitoring and project management.
- Increased contact with research and other institutions to enhance scientific information exchange from which the project will use to improve management of the forests.

## **Discussion:**

(Mbwana) The strategies should perhaps be more elaborated, i.e. how will these issues be done. More explicit and concrete elaboration. (Kiama) How e.g. will village governments be involved. (Katigula) Most of the explicit issues are mentioned in the outputs, activities, inputs sections of the draft project document.

(Kinni) The approach seems quite acceptable to the GOF, e.g. stressing the sustainability aspects. The long-term external support need. What is the role of the project. Should Phase II be amalgamated into the Tanga Catchment Forest Office. Allowance and transport. GOF provides vehicles, GOT cannot even provide fuel. Same applies to allowances, at least GOT rates should be used. Housing is also one of the issues that the GOT should provide, actually even for the CTA. The GOT commitments should be discussed. If there are no funds then there should be other commitments. Conditionalities should be considered as GOT commitments, e.g. regarding the establishment of the ANR. Conditions should be specified before FINNIDA is deciding on the project.

(Kiama) The aspect of self-support should be seriously considered even for this Phase II. Ways should be suggested on how to increase self-sufficiency and sustainability. For instance, the option of eco-tourism should be considered. Comprehensive training programmes should be developed for staff training whether abroad or in Tanzania, identify institutions resource, persons etc.

(Mbwana) The water charges to manage the forest resources would be an important way of generating revenue. Many of the natural resources benefits and amenities are taken for granted. For instance Pangani water basin has started charging water users. TANESCO is paying the Hale Office.

(Msanga) The project management should propose these issues to the government so that decisions can be made. The cost-effectiveness of the project is important. In Farm Forestry there is some overlapping with the EUCADP. Project should sit down and discuss these issues.

(Enhardt) Mbwana has a strong point. Muheza is badly off in terms of water. If people are paying they would be more careful using water. E.g. NMRI is a large water user. Relocating may be difficult considering the water shortage in Muheza. The collaboration between the projects should be elaborated. Some major issues are: Areas which will be gazetted and the proposed corridors. The projects are working on these issues together. Tree labelling for the ABG. Collaboration in the villages will require agreeing on the approaches and procedures. E.g. Village Conservation Committees. Katigula mentioned the importance of involving local communities in the implementation. E.g ANR Advisory Board does not include villagers on the board.

Massawe requested Msanga to elaborate his question. (Msanga) Recommendations should be made by the project for decision makers. Budgets should be realistic and build on possible long-term sustainability. Sustainability is a problem. Usually project collapse after the donor has pulled out. The project should look into the future of how to sustain activities initiated by the projects. In future natural resources sector may to an increasing degree be privatised. How will these issues be taken into account.

(Sawe, to respond on the establishment of ANR) As far as the legal issue is concerned the project cannot affect the legal establishment. It is the FBD and the MTNRE to promote the issue and develop means for the legal establishment. A consultancy was conducted but still most decisions are pending. (Mbonde) There are two things; legislation and conditionalities. Are we discussing the nature reserve as a category or the ANR entity. The project has not clearly tabled what it actually meant with the nature reserve. Conditionality; should the project be tuned into a realistic scope. All facets should be tabled. Conditionalities from external sources may be a bit risky ending.

(Kinni) Clarifying the conditionality. The ANR should not be left dragging on if it is not possible to implement it.

(Johansson) Elaborated on the legal, institutional and organisational complications and problems connected with the establishment of the Amani Nature Reserve. He also elaborated on the division of mandates and collaboration between the EUCFP and EUCADP. He briefly touched the issue of invasive species such as *Maesopsis eminii*.

(Mbwana) Tanzania is a signatory of several conventions. We should insist on establishing the ANR as a strict nature reserve. The new FO makes a provision for the establishment of a nature reserve. The question is when and in what form the new FO will be accepted. On the issue of the conditionality. The one who benefits should share the costs. (Katigula) The ANR is in the making. In a few weeks time we will have the entity established. The proposals of

Msanga are quite in line with the thinking of the project. Enhardt village involvement, representatives of the village leadership is part of the Advisory Board.

## PHASE II INPUTS AND RESOURCES

**Luciana E. Mshana**

### INTRODUCTION

Inputs are resources such as funds, personnel, materials services etc. which are required for achieving the stated objectives. The Phase II inputs have been identified according to type(s) of activities to be performed. Each of the project components has got specific activities and therefore specific inputs. Similar activities in different components will have similar inputs and vice versa.

### INPUT CATEGORIES

The EUCFP Design Team has identified six (6) categories of inputs for the Phase II as follows: Transport; Personnel (staff); Training; Tools, Equipments, Materials and Supplies; Construction and Renovation; and Other Inputs. The list of inputs per category is a combination of the needs for all project components indicated in Chapter 4 of the Draft Project Document.

Transportation means will vary from vehicles, motorcycles to bicycles. Other inputs included under transport are fuel costs, spare parts and maintenance costs.

Project personnel is comprised of two categories. One is the Tanzanian personnel. They will be provided by the Government of Tanzania. These include the Project Manager, technical and other support staff directly attached to the project. Others will be those Tanzanian personnel not directly attached to the project but rather collaborating with project staff. These include researchers, survey and inventory team, local contractors and consultants, crop assessment team, and Administrators. The second category is the Chief Technical Adviser (CTA), who will be provided by the Supporting Organisation.

Training inputs aim at improving the institutional capacity to plan and manage forests on sustainable basis. Training will be provided to professional, technical and support staff with focus on defined project needs. Training will also be offered to villagers in-terms of extension service, workshops, seminars and study tours.

Project staff training will range from long-term e.g. M.Sc. in natural resource management, to short-term courses in various relevant fields; such as computer skills, extension, PRA, community forestry and agroforestry, women in development and gender issues, vehicle maintenance etc.

Tools, equipment, materials and supplies form another input category. These are further broken-down into sub-categories like camping equipment, survey equipment, nursery equipment, office stationery and supplies, protective gear, and clothing etc.

The project will also be engaged in construction and renovation during Phase II. Construction will range from simple forest guard stations to housing like the Amani Nature Reserve rest house; headquarters; staff housing; nature trails and extension of office for Longuza station. Six (6) houses for the field station in-charges will be renovated.

The last category is Other Inputs. These refer to funding for specific activities such as crop compensation for gazettement of new forest reserves and enlargements; and recurrent costs of electricity, generator fuel, water and communications.

**FUNDING**

The financial contribution, from the Government of Finland will be 15.2 million Finnish Markka. Tanzania Government will contribute 57.1 million Tanzanian shillings. On this basis, the GOF will provide 96 percent and GOT will provide 4 percent of the project costs.

The role of the Tanzanian Government (GOT) as for as inputs/resources are concerned, will be to provide the Tanzanian personnel and pay their salaries. The GOT will also cover salary costs of personnel who will collaborate with the project on some activities. FINNIDA will cover the costs of remaining inputs and other allowances.

Based upon the overall project design, the budget projection is summarized by project components and cost categories (Tables 1 and 2).

**Table 1.** Budget distribution by project components (1FIM= 90.91 Ths. (June 1994). Interest rate= 3 percent).

Category	Percentage
Nature Conservation	6.51
Catchment Forestry	20.69
Farm Forestry	2.02
Institutional Support	34.39
Ecological Monitoring & Research	4.63

From the table above, institutional support component takes almost 34.4 percent of the total budget. This is the largest proportion in the budget, followed by catchment Forestry component which takes 20.7 percent of the overall project budget.

The table above indicates that, the major cost categories are technical assistance with 28.6 percent, personnel and consulting cost with 18.9 percent, Transport costs with 14.1 percent, staff training with 10.2 percent, crop compensation costs with 7.5 percent and construction and Renovation with 7.5 percent and office costs with 6.1 percent of the overall project budget.

**Table 2.** Budget distribution by cost categories (1FIM= 90.91 Ths. (June 1994). Interest rate= 3 percent).

Cost category	Percentage
Local Personnel	18.94
Staff training	10.22
Extension	0.64
Transport	14.11
Crop compensation	7.54
Nurseries	0.86
Tool, equipment, protective gear	2.39
Construction and renovation	7.46
Office costs	6.06
Technical assistance	28.59

**Discussion:**

(Kinni) Personnel categories, Tanzanian, staff, CTA. Is there no need for consultancies. (Msahana) most consultants would be local.

(Kimaro) When land is compensated, only crops are compensated. Why are the forests not compensated. This could be proposed for the government. When people are required to protect trees, ownership of trees should be addressed. (Mshana) only crops are compensated. (Massawe) Compensations should be carefully considered. Only cultivated land is compensated. The crop valuation is a standard procedure. (Mbwana) We are trying to explore possibilities to improve conservation. Many farmers have forests but the current ordinance is a disincentive to conserve trees. Tree tenure issues should be reviewed.

(Holmgren) Important to focus on project staff training. Communication is important. The field staff should be trained to communicate and work with communities and visitors. Staff training should take into account all staff levels.

(Mayawalla) Why is extension services given such a low priority. The DT may need to revise the budget. (Msanga) Supporting Mayawalla. Extension services and farm forestry is given quite low priority.

(Johansson) The low budget is not really low priority it merely reflects the piloting approach and the division of mandates between the two projects. The mandate of EUCFP is the protected areas whether F.R. of ANR whereas the EUCADP focused on the communities and supporting conservation through community support. (Mshana) Elaborated on the training issue. There is training on all levels. The support staff is also included.

---

## **RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SENIOR FOREST OFFICERS REVIEW TEAM**

### **Ladislav Nshubemuki & George Mbonde**

Nshubemuki pointed out that despite the good work done their task was to make a critical review. Real participation is rarely seen practice, the exercise shows a bold step in implementing the rhetorics. The comments are constructive. The team should take into account the exercise in their CV's. It has been a rough task and experts are not developed through osmosis.

#### **Project sustainability**

Problem and objective trees were analysed and these were quite well articulated. The major problems is sustainability; ecological and financial. Both have not been sufficiently addressed. If these are not addressed the project may be overtaken by events.

The financial sustainability is a difficult issue. If stakeholders can be approached for seed money, which could be used for the management of the area. Some aspects may be (see p. 4 in their report).

#### **Management of the forest ecosystems**

See pages 5-6 in their report. Some new technical issues should be re-considered. The establishment of the boundaries should be prioritized, use of people who have experience from Amani should be used.

#### **Incorporation of the local communities**

The issue was well addressed. However, the marketing produce should be thought of. The marketing aspects should be considered while introducing new products e.g. in the farm forestry component. Specialization should be the main focus of consideration.

#### **Development of activities and workplans to implement the project.**

Proposals have been elaborated in the matrixes. Some of the logical linkages between outputs and activities and inputs. Especially attention should be paid to the sequential presentation of issues. While reviewing the document this should be taken care of. E.g. the NIMR issue should carefully considered. The shifting if taking place may considerably influence the budget and activities of the project. Provisions should be made to take this into account.

#### **Resources and inputs**

The team was quite satisfied. It also proposed the inclusion of Longuza Teak Project because of the financial sustainability issue.

#### **Institutional and organizational aspects**



The practicability of solutions are questioned. E.g. combining extension and enforcement. The team proposed a maximum of four main sections. Planning and Development Unit; Forest Management Unit; Nature Reserve Manager; Administration Unit.

It is problematic if forestry takes too much of the extension which is basically agricultural related. Collaboration with agricultural extension should be sought. Forest Management Unit should take care of management and enforcement. This should be divided into catchment forestry and Longuza Plantations. The Nature Reserve Manager should deal with all issues pertaining to the establishment of the Nature Reserve. Collaboration with other bodies is essential for the whole project.

### **Discussion:**

(Johansson) Congratulated the Team on the recommendations and the report. The role of Longuza must be clarified.

(Mbwana) Congratulated the Team. FBD position on the Steering Committee; Katigula is also a manager of the catchment forest project. Is this the best arrangement. What is the stand. Some of the time is used for CFP. The term manager is used throughout. This is not the official title in the FBD structure. The Teams stand on the Task Force. Village environmental committees should be considered in the extension. The role and potential of Longuza may be over-emphasized. First and foremost it should develop its own activities. Sustainability may be achieved in different ways. There is too little horizontal integration (between project and institutions). Maximize combined use of resources. Empowerment of the people, can be a way to reduce the management costs of maintaining the reserves. Benefits must be clear for the involvement of the farmers. Which is the FBD position of commercial plantations.

(Mayawalla) The new policy advocates productive ventures to be run in a commercial way. Hence revenues would be channelled back to the productive venture. The private sector is encouraged to take part in the productive/commercial ventures. Exploitation and economic growth must be balanced. Tentatively 50% has been proposed. Later on possibly 100%.

(Mbonde) The DT did not touch the Longuza issue. Longuza could however, provide funds for the project. The question of buffer zones should also be discussed. The Steering Committee role should be discussed. The role and mandate of the Steering Committee should be discussed. The Task Force TOR should be developed and discussed. There may be overlapping roles with other decision making bodies of the project such as the Steering Committee. The role of the managers and the CFP and the EUCFP. Should focus be on the institution support and strengthening rather than the project concept approach.

(Katigula) Thanked the Team for their commendable job. The Dt will make use of their comments to improve the document. It should be FBDs responsibility on the establishment and mandate of the EUCFP.

(Johansson) Clarified the issue of the problems with decision-making authority of the Steering Committee with respect to decisions made by the FBD.

(Kinni) Agreed on the previous comment. The decision should be made within the GOT so that a functional proposal is made.

## TERM OF REFERENCE FOR THE EUCFP APPRAISAL TEAM

### Antti Rytönen

The Team Leader, Antti Rytönen presented some comments. He commended the DT and the SFT for their work. The total budget is relatively big and there seems to be alarming signs in the catchment. There are more risks that have been elaborated in the project document. The fragmentation of the area is the major threat to the basic mission of the project, i.e. conserving the biodiversity. Is the project too late? The dynamics and the rate of loss is the most alarming issue and a major threat.

He mentioned some of the tasks of the Appraisal Mission. He requested for support from all participants to facilitate the Appraisal Process. The members of the team are:

Anna Mayawalla expert in financial, socio-cultural, gender, and planning issues;  
Saidi Mbwana experts in forestry catchment forestry, conservation, institutional, and participation issues;  
Valdemar Holmgren expert in biodiversity, conservation, East Africa;  
Antti Rytönen, Resource economist looking at finance, policy, institutional, and policy aspects.

He commended the DT for its contribution and work on preparing the draft project document. Reserves for future, catchment forestry for water users, production forestry for users. The document reflects these issues well. Implementability is difficult. Some major questions. Is level of financing OK? The task is great, is financing too low? This calls for collaboration between different project and institutions. He commended the inclusion of the farm forestry component. Then catchment forestry and nature conservation as other core issues. The corridor issue should be tackled? Is it viable even if the corridors are established. The income aspects are important. The document reflects well the inputs but is weak on defining outputs. Income, revenue aspects should be elaborated. These are essential for financial viability. Crop compensations are important to secure certain areas.

### **Discussion:**

(The Chairman) Thanked the Team Leader for the comments.

(Kinni) On 7 September a project meeting will be held in Helsinki. Funds, conditions etc. will be discussed. After this discussions with FBD and then Steering Committee meeting possibly in Dar es Salaam.

The chairman thanked participants. He mentioned some important issues requiring further elaboration in the project document. These include the Amani Nature Reserve, relocation of NIMR, training, collaboration with other sectors and institutions, the role of the Steering Committee, and recommendations for sustainability and use of resources for long-term financial sustainability.

(Kinni) Recommended the consistent use Government of Finland (GOF) instead of FINNIDA, and the use of GOT throughout the document. Should the project be merged with the catchment office in Tanga? She also mentioned that M.Sc programmes often have a condition that people are provided on the condition that people return to work for the project for two years.

---

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

### Steering Committee

Mr. C.M. Kiama, Regional Administrative Officer, Tanga Region  
Ms. Seija Kinni, First Secretary, Embassy of Finland, Dar es Salaam  
Mr. L.L.J. Massawe, Regional Forest Officer, Tanga Region  
Ms. Generoza Kamuzora, Planning Commission, Dar es Salaam

### East Usambara Catchment Forest Project Design Team

Mr. Masaba I.L. Katigula, Project Manager, Tanga  
Mr. Mwanaidi S. Kijazi, Monitoring In-Charge, Tanga  
Mr. Steven E. Mmasi, Assistant Deputy Project Manager, Tanga  
Ms. Luciana E. Mshana, Ag. Survey and Mapping In-Charge, Tanga  
Mr. Corodius Sawe, Ag. Deputy Project Manager, Tanga  
Mr. Matiko Wambura, Extension and Enforcement In-Charge, Tanga

Mr. Stig Johansson, Chief Technical Adviser, Tanga

### Senior Forest Officers Team

Mr. George Mbonde, Forestry and Beekeeping Division, Dar es Salaam  
Mr. Ladislaus Nshubemuki, Tanzania Forestry Research Institute, Morogoro

### Observers

Mr. Preben Enhardt, Chief Technical Adviser, East Usambara Conservation and Agricultural Development Project  
Mr. Kimaro, Forest Officer, East Usambara Conservation and Agricultural Development Project  
Mr. Leonard Lyimo, Forest Officer Longuza Teak Project  
Mr. Msanga, Planning Officer, Regional Development Directors Office, Tanga Region  
Mr. Sosthenes Rwamugira, East Usambara Catchment Forest Project

### EUCFP Phase II Appraisal Team

Mr. Antti Rytönen, Consultant, Helsinki  
Mr. Valdemar Holmgren, Consultant, Nairobi  
Ms. Anna Mayawalla, Planning Commission, Dar es Salaam  
Mr. Saidi Mbwana, Department of Environment, Dar es Salaam

**PHASE II PROJECT DOCUMENT REVIEW WORKSHOP PROGRAMME****Mkonge Hotel, 25 August 1994**

- 09:15      **Opening of the workshop**  
                Regional Administrative Officer
- 09:30      **Planning Phase II of the EUCFP - A participatory Approach**  
                S.E. Mmasi, Assistant Deputy Project Manager, EUCFP
- 09:45      Discussion
- 10:00      **Phase I of the EUCFP and the need for and target groups in Phase II**  
                C.T. Sawe, Ag. Deputy Project Manager, EUCFP  
                M.S. Kijazi, Monitoring In-Charge, EUCFP
- 10:15      Discussion
- 10:35      **Phase II objectives and project components**  
                M.J.N. Wambura, Enforcement & Extension In-Charge, EUCFP
- 10:50      Discussion
- 11:10      TEA/COFFEE BREAK
- 11:40      **Phase II strategies**  
                M.I.L. Katigula, Project Manager, EUCFP
- 11:45      Discussion
- 12:05      **Phase II resources and inputs**  
                L.E. Mshana, Ag. Survey & Mapping In-Charge, EUCFP
- 12:25      Discussion
- 12:45      **Recommendations of the Senior Forest Officers Review Team**  
                L. Nshubemuki, TAFORI
- 13:15      Discussion
- 13:35      **Terms of Reference for the EUCFP Appraisal Mission**  
                A. Rytkönen, Team Leader, GOF/GOT Appraisal Team
- 13:50      Discussion
- 14:10      **Closing of the Workshop**  
                Regional Administrative Officer
- 14:15      TEA/COFFEE BREAK
- 14:30      EUCFP Steering Committee Meeting
- 15:00      LUNCH

## **East Usambara Catchment Forest Project Working Paper Series**

The East Usambara Catchment Forest Project Working Paper Series consists of miscellaneous reports of the East Usambara Catchment Forest Project such as seminar and workshop proceedings, papers presenting various policy, administrative and technical issues primarily for internal use and consideration. The prime aim of the series as a supplement to the East Usambara Catchment Forest Project Technical Paper Series (ISSN 1236-620X) is to capture and document comprehensively the activities and writings of the project.

The reports are prepared primarily by staff members of the East Usambara Catchment Forest Project or by other researchers, consultants and interested individuals. The views expressed in the reports are those of the author(s).

### **Current titles in the series are:**

- 1. Johansson, S. 1994. Forest conservation in the East Usambara mountains - A Map supplement.**
- 2. Sawe, C.T., Mmasi, S., Mshana, I. & Johansson, S.G. 1994. Proceedings of a workshop on the planning of Phase II of the East Usambara Catchment Forest Project, 20 April 1994, Panori Motel, Tanga.**
- 3. Johansson, S.G. (Ed.). 1995. Proceedings of the EUCFP Phase II project document review workshop, Mkonge Hotel, 25 August 1994.**