

Sustaining Livelihoods in Sub-Saharan Africa

Issue: 17

November 2005

Theme: Participatory Forest Management in Tanzania (PFM)

Contents of this issue:

PFM and the SL approach Contextual background to PFM in Tanzania
An enabling policy environment
Outcomes and impacts Lessons learnt
Useful References and Internet Resources
SL Activities Feedback please!

Editor's notes

This newsletter coincides with the launch of Khanya-African Institute for Community Driven Development (Khanya-aicdd), formed from what was previously Khanya-managing rural change, which has been based in the Free State, South Africa since 1988. We reflect the change in the amended title of the SLSA newsletter though the acronym can remain! **Please let us know what you think of the SLSA series by emailing us your responses to the questions at the end of the newsletter.**

This edition focuses on Participatory Forest Management (PFM) in Tanzania and how PFM has supported the implementation of sustainable livelihoods. The authors are Tom Blomley, Participatory Forest Management Adviser, Forestry and Beekeeping Division, Dar es Salaam and Hadija Ramadhani, Forest Officer (Extension) within the Extension and Publicity Unit of the same Division. This paper is based on a longer version presented by the authors at the 17th Commonwealth Forestry Conference in Colombo, Sri Lanka in April 2005.

Introduction – and overview of PFM and the SL framework

Participatory Forest Management (PFM) is a strategy to achieve sustainable forest management by encouraging the management or co-management of forest and woodland resources by the communities living closest to them, supported by a range of other stakeholders drawn from local government, civil society and the private sector. PFM in Tanzania has three principal policy objectives:

1. To maintain or enhance forest quality and condition;
2. To enhance local livelihoods through increased forest revenues and supply of subsistence forest products;
3. To establish or strengthen effective and representative village NRM institutions.

Their relationship to sustainable livelihoods is outlined in Table 1 below which links key aspects of the SL framework with the impact of PFM.

Table 1: Links between PFM and aspects of the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework

SL factors	Impact of PFM
Preserving and utilizing natural capital	By conserving and sustainably utilizing communal property resources, communities have a resource they can use over the long term and which provides an alternative to on-farm livelihoods.
Increasing financial assets	Increasing incomes both at group and community levels but also potentially at individual or household levels.
Transforming structures and processes	By putting locally elected institutions in charge of the management of revenue sources there is potential for improving local governance
	Increased linkages to external service providers (such as local government and NGOs)

This article outlines the extent to which PFM in Tanzania has begun to achieve these objectives and contribute to improving the livelihoods of the local communities involved.

Contextual background to PFM in Tanzania

Of the estimated 33 million hectares of forest land in Tanzania, 57% is largely unprotected and occurs outside government forest reserves (URT, 2001). The National Forest Policy explicitly recognizes this and provides incentives for forest management at the lowest level of local government – the village – which number over 11,000 in Tanzania. In the early 1990s a number of pilot PFM activities were started which collectively demonstrated the viability of PFM under a range of social and economic conditions. These experiments across the country coincided with a review of the forest policy and legislation in the late 1990s, together with sweeping reforms in Tanzania's economic and political spheres, and directly contributed to a favourable legal environment for PFM. Currently, mainland Tanzania has one of the most advanced community forestry jurisdictions in Africa as reflected in policy, law and practice (Wily, 2000) and around 2.8 million hectares of forest land is now under various PFM arrangements across the country as illustrated below on Table 2:

Table 2: Coverage of PFM in Tanzania as of 2003

Community Based Forest Management (CBFM)		
Forest area under CBFM (hectares)	Number of Villages with CBFM	Source of Data: NGOs, area based projects, national survey, government records
1,085,306	1,484	
Joint Forest Management (JFM)		

Forest area under JFM (hectares)	No. of villages with JFM	Source of Data: NGOs, area based projects, national survey, government records
1,863,623	525	

An enabling policy environment

Two main approaches for implementing PFM are being promoted in Tanzania as presented in Table 2 above:

Joint Forest Management (JFM) is a collaborative management approach, which divides forest management responsibility and returns between government (either central or local) and forest adjacent communities. It takes place on land reserved for forest management such as National Forest Reserves (NFRs) - for catchment, mangrove or production purposes - and Local Government Forest Reserves (LGFRs).

Community Based Forest Management (CBFM) takes place in forests on "village land" which has been surveyed and registered under the provisions of the Village Land Act (1999) and managed by the village council. Under CBFM, villagers take full ownership and management responsibility for an area of forest within their jurisdiction and declared by village and district government as a Village Forest Reserve. Following this legal transfer of rights and responsibilities from central to village government, villagers gain the right to harvest timber and forest products, collect and retain forest royalties, undertake patrols (including arresting and fining offenders) and are exempted from local government taxes on forest products, regulations regarding "reserved tree" species, and are not obliged to remit any part of their royalties to either central or local government. The underlying policy goal for CBFM is to progressively bring large areas of unprotected woodlands and forests under village management and protection through the establishment of Village Land Forest Reserves.

The National Forest Policy (1998) provides a clear direction and mandate for PFM and the Forest Act (2002) gives further legislative support to these broad policy directions by enabling local communities to declare – and ultimately gazette – Village, Group or Private Forest Reserves.

The Forest Act also provides for registration and other procedures through which villages, groups or individuals may secure local jurisdiction over forests or take on management functions in Central and Local Government Forest Reserves through the establishment of Joint Forest Management (JFM) Agreements with the appropriate government authority.

The National Forest Programme (2001 – 2010), provides a strategic framework and plan for the implementation of the Forest Act and Policy and PFM is identified as a priority area for implementation under Sub Programme One (Forest Resources Conservation and Management Programme) (URT, 2001). This positive and forward looking legal and policy environment, allowing for the devolution of ownership and management responsibilities over forest resources to local communities, is greatly facilitating the scaling up of PFM in Tanzania. (URT 1998; Wily and Dewees 2001). What this shows is a range of measures happening at macro (policy) level, meso level (eg local government) and at micro level (village).

Outcomes and impacts

Improved natural assets

Experiences appear to confirm the general assumption that PFM, when well facilitated, can lead to recovery and/or maintenance of forest quality. Although empirical evidence is scanty and long-term ecological monitoring has been very limited, many villages responsible for forest management under PFM arrangements are reporting important indicators such as:

- improvements in water discharge and quality from PFM areas;
- increasing signs of natural regeneration in degraded areas;
- reduced incidences of fire;
- reduced village revenue from fines, due to reduction in illegal activities;
- reduction in encroachment of agricultural land into forest areas;
- increases in game and wildlife numbers/diversity.

Therefore, evidence appears to mounting that PFM does indeed contribute to sustainable forest management whether under CBFM arrangements on village land, or under JFM arrangements in reserved land. However, further research and documentation is required to confirm this conclusively.

Improved financial assets

Evidence about improved financial assets within communities is perhaps less clear, particularly with regard to the more tangible, economic returns from forest management. A recent assessment of PFM in Iringa district (Topp-Jørgensen et al, 2004) revealed average annual village incomes of US\$653 per year from CBFM forests and only US\$189 from JFM areas inside national forest reserves). This appears to be for a range of reasons, some of which are identified below:

- Much of the early PFM was carried out on degraded forest land that had little merchantable timber left. This meant that utilisation opportunities for forest managers were limited and long lead-times were required before the forests became commercially viable.
- Given national and international interests with regard to securing critical forest ecosystems, much of the early donor funding to PFM was directed towards high biodiversity forests (such as 'catchment forests'). Given their national and global values, local use options (and corresponding management responsibilities) tend to be minimal.
- Fines collected by local patrols from illegal activities occurring within the forest represent an important income source for village forest managers - particularly where the forest status precludes many economically productive activities such as timber harvesting. As forest areas are bought under effective village control, and incentives for open access harvesting reduce, so illegal activities drop and income from fines tends to reduce. In many cases, this has resulted in revenues to village forest management committees being reduced to a dangerously low level – to the point where they now jeopardise the viability of maintaining even skeleton village forest management costs.
- As forests are managed in more sustainable ways, wildlife populations tend to increase and re-colonise from surrounding areas. The ability of villages to cash-in on this new-found resource remains limited due to the restrictive and bureaucratic rules and regulations regarding community wildlife management in Tanzania. Consequently, increase in wildlife numbers in PFM areas often represents an unwanted and growing cost due to crop raiding and damage to property. This is particularly an issue with regard to larger mammals such as elephants and buffaloes, which threaten life and property.
- Even where villagers have legal rights to large areas of woodland and forest resources – there appears to be a reticence to capitalise and utilise these assets. The reasons for this

apparent paradox are unclear but may be caused by overcautious district staff and central government foresters who maintain a "conservation and protection" agenda and are continuously warning villagers about the dangers of over-utilisation.

Recent experiences point to some very real economic opportunities for village-level forest managers.

Suledo village forest reserve, Kiteto District. Shared between nine villages and covering an area of 60,000 hectares (plus an additional 94,000 hectares of grazing land with significant tree cover), this area of dry miombo woodland was transferred formally to community based forest management in 2001. A participatory forest resource assessment has revealed high levels of commercially viable miombo species such as Mpingo (*Dalbergia Melaloxylon*), Mninga (*Pterocarpus angolensis*) and Mkalakala (*Brachystegia spp*). A simple analysis of annual harvestable timber volumes (using the low level government royalty rates) shows a potential revenue of USD 140,000, or around USD 15,000 per village per year.

Angai village forest reserve, Liwale district. Covering a total forest area of 154,000 hectares, thirteen villages share this high-value, and largely unexploited coastal forest. Although the villages are still in the process of establishing and declaring village management and control, conservative estimates reveal that a sustainable harvesting management regime could generate between USD 730,000 to USD 820,000 per year (or around USD 70,000 USD per village per year).

Under such conditions, fragile and emerging village level institutions may not have enough capacity to manage and oversee the collection and disbursement of such level of funding. Clearly, alternative management options will have to be investigated, such as developing lease or tender arrangements of forest operations between villagers and private sector operators.

Lessons learnt

It is becoming increasingly clear that PFM is not a panacea, and does not perform equally under all conditions. A number of factors appear to influence the likelihood of PFM contributing to sustainable livelihoods.

The environmental condition of the forest

As mentioned above, many of the earlier examples of PFM took place on highly degraded land (where community involvement was sought as a last resort rather than strategy of choice) and consequently potential incentives, returns and incomes in the early stages were minimal. For many communities, faced with high levels of poverty, long-term environmental rehabilitation is a cost they simply cannot afford.

Prevailing economic conditions

Market forces for forest products vary enormously across Tanzania and can both drive or destroy PFM processes. Where market forces are extremely high it may prove impossible for villages to prevent the relentless and illegal stripping of assets by outsiders - typically charcoal and timber - thereby undermining the whole PFM process. Where markets are weak (for example due to poor roads or large distances from centres of demand) villagers may be unable to sell their produce and become disillusioned, although forests remain largely in tact with abundant high value species. Where PFM areas are located adjacent to open access forest resources, illegal extraction of forest produce in non-PFM areas, and the subsequent low cost to producers, may undermine attempts by villagers to market their produce at a reasonable price.

In many cases, PFM has the potential to generate significant revenue at village level. If a critical mass of villagers successfully establish PFM within any given district, even the remittance of a minimal percentage (for example 5%) could cumulatively provide a revenue for district level PFM operations. If enough economically viable PFM operations are developed nationally, funds could be remitted back to and retained by central government to cover investment costs of PFM in new areas. For this to be successful, there needs to be political will at all levels to retain and reinvest forest revenues back into forest management.

Given the shortage of locally generated funds at village and district level, political pressures for utilising these funds for more general development activities (building schools and clinics) often out-competes demands for reinvestment back into forest management. Currently, the bulk of funding for PFM establishment comes from international donors. However, increasingly, these funds should be viewed as "investment capital" - required funding with which to establish a self funding PFM system, rather than maintain it indefinitely. Cost recovery, and reinvestment of PFM revenues must therefore remain a priority as PFM moves towards a national programme.

The development of low-cost PFM models also requires consideration as an alternative to the consequences of being driven largely by externally funded and facilitated projects: an artificially inflated environment – made up of concentrated funding in a single area, external advisers, parallel structures, high levels of expectations and complex field processes that are beyond the reach of local institutions. These costly processes need to be "stripped-down" to low cost models that can be replicated from one end of the country to the other and under the wide range of conditions that are found nationally. The risk though is of over-simplification leading to a poorly facilitated process and low-quality outputs.

Legal status of forests under management

As mentioned earlier, central government catchment forest reserves, while providing valuable services at the national and even international level (through provision of biodiversity, water catchment and carbon functions), generate few concrete financial returns to villagers. Under current arrangements, the long-term viability of many JFM agreements in catchment forests seems questionable and alternative sources of income and benefits may have to be considered.

Despite the promising legal environment that exists for PFM in Tanzania, an understanding of the law by forest users and managers - particularly rural communities- as well as facilitators and practitioners - district and NGO staff - remains very limited. This widespread problem is compounded by additional factors. For example, laws are developed separately for ministries and sectors such as land, local government, wildlife and forestry. Although not directly conflicting, the integration of these legal instruments at local level remains confused and complex. In addition, those responsible for disseminating and implementing the laws – such as district technical staff – may be unwilling to divest power from themselves to villagers (for example transferring the licensing of forest products on general lands to villagers on village land following village land registration).

Clearly, therefore raising community-level legal awareness remains a priority and must be done through a range of channels, such as civil society, radio, mass media, in ways which to demand driven services – from the community to the districts.

Balancing flexibility and innovation with policy compliance and standardization

There is a clear need to work towards greater standardisation, harmonisation and quality control in the wide array of approaches being implemented across Tanzania. Local practitioners and facilitators often request policy guidance, implementation manuals and practical guidelines on "how to do" PFM. This legitimate demand from the field must be carefully balanced with the need for embracing innovation and local adaptation. Providing too many guidelines and too rigid

a implementation framework can easily lead to suffocation and institutional paralysis. Providing too little guidance, on the other hand, can lead to PFM activities becoming blurred and largely unrecognisable on the ground.

Developing a national monitoring framework that captures PFM outcomes

Project based monitoring tends to be externally managed and funded with limited time-horizons and sustainability. By making PFM a national programme, integrated within existing governmental structures and systems, monitoring needs to be similarly integrated within broader forest and livelihood monitoring initiatives. Consequently, PFM monitoring must be integrated within the operations of the primary implementing structures such as FBD, local governments and village institutions.

Integrating PFM planning and implementation within other sectors and structures at district level and below

Despite the fact that district PFM plans and budgets are being developed by district council staff, it appears that integration of PFM with other forestry related activities within district plans, as well as other natural resource sectors remains very limited. District staff still essentially views PFM as a "project", and not as part and parcel of routine district level activities. Despite repeated calls upon districts to engage with other projects or NGOs working on PFM in their area, again, co-ordination by district staff with these external initiatives remains poor. Related to this is the apparent resistance for the district to allocate a portion of their PFM budgets towards engaging external service providers to deliver specific PFM-related services at village level, even in areas where well established local NGOs are present and operating. Outsourcing of service provision by districts has the potential to address the very real capacity issues facing district technical and extension staff.

Conclusion

Four decades of 'project-based' development has left a strong and enduring mark on Tanzania. Moving away from this approach towards one that builds upon government systems and structures requires time, persistence and a change in mind set from both donors and government. Significant challenges remain with regard to building the capacity of local government staff to a level where they can respond to PFM demands from rural communities effectively and efficiently. Transforming government institutions from agencies that enforce, regulate, control and restrict to ones that facilitate, support, decentralise and disengage cannot occur overnight but is a key to transforming structures and processes that benefit the poor. As government increasingly invests in PFM as a tool for sustainable livelihoods, it is important to target scarce resources to those areas where chances of achieving outcomes will be maximised. This will necessitate a more thorough analysis of PFM performance criteria across a range of social, environmental and institutional conditions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

The authors wish to thank Dawn Hartley and Fred Nelson for their invaluable comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

REFERENCES:

SJOHOLM, H AND LOUNO, S. 2002. Traditional pastoral communities securing green pastures through participatory forest management. The case of Kiteto District, United Republic of Tanzania. in: Proceedings of second international workshop on participatory forestry in Africa. FAO, Rome. 455 pp .

TOPP-JØRGENSEN. E, POULSEN. MK, LUND, JF, AND MASSAO, JF (in press) Community-based monitoring of natural resource use and forest quality in montane forests and miombo woodlands in Iringa District, Tanzania. Biological Conservation (forthcoming in Conservation Biology). 19 pp.

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA (URT) 1998. National Forest Policy, The United Republic of Tanzania. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, 59 pp.

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA (URT) 1999. Village Land Act (and regulations) No. 5 of 1999. Ministry of Lands and Human Settlements. The United Republic of Tanzania. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, 227 pp.

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA (URT). 2001. National Forest Programme 2001 – 2010. Forestry and Beekeeping Division, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. 133 pp.

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA (URT), 2002. The Forest Act, no. 7 of 7th June 2002, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, The United Republic of Tanzania. Government Printer, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, 174 pp.

WILY L.A. AND DEWEES P.A. 2001. From Users to Custodians – Changing Relations between People and the State in Forest Management in Tanzania. Policy Research Working Paper, WPS 2569, Environment and Social Development Unit, The World Bank, 31 pp.

Key documents about Tanzanian PFM

Those noted in references above and:

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA (URT). 2003. Participatory Forest Management: A Report on Lessons Learned. Forestry and Beekeeping Division, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. 71 pp

WILY L.A. AND DEWEES P.A. 2001. From Users to Custodians – Changing Relations between People and the State in Forest Management in Tanzania. Policy Research Working Paper, WPS 2569, Environment and Social Development Unit, The World Bank, 31 pp.

Forestry and Beekeeping Division of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism are currently building a website that will have a selection of downloadable documents on PFM and other aspects of forest management in Tanzania. The website is still being developed but can be visited at <http://www.nfp.co.tz/html/>

Useful resources

In **South Africa eight PFM Guidelines** have been prepared as part of the DWAF/Danida PFM Project (2001-2005). They comprise Stakeholder Participation, Legal Options for Community Partnerships with DWAF Forestry, Logical Framework Approach Project Planning, Sustainable Resource Use, Project Monitoring and Evaluation. Fundraising for Projects, Formation of PFM Forums and Committees, Financial Management of Projects. They are available from the Deputy Director: PFM: Mike Modise in DWAF, Pretoria (tel: 012 336 7775) or via ModiseM@dwaf.gov.za

<http://www.livelihoods.org/post/cbnrm-theme1.html>

<http://www.fao.org/forestry/foris/webview/forestry2/index.jsp?siteId=4321&langId=1>

http://www.fao.org/documents/show_cdr.asp?url_file=/DOCREP/006/Y4807B/Y4807B00.HTM

<http://www.fao.org/docrep/x8080e/x8080e04.htm>

http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/docs/_ref/research/acm/index.htm

Upcoming SL-related activities/programmes

International Conference on HIV/AIDS and STIs in Africa. 4 December 2005 - 9 December 2005, Abuja, Nigeria. Organised by: Society for AIDS in Africa. Deadline for applications: 4 November 2005. For details contact: Ms. Uche Osoka uosoka.registration@icasa2005.org.ng

Harnessing the Partnership of the Public and Non-State Sectors for Sustainable Development and Good Governance in Africa: Problems and the Way Forward. 28 November 2005 - 2 December 2005, Zambezi Sun Hotel, Zambia. Organised by African Association of Public Administration and Management. Contact aapam@africaonline.co.ke

Households in Conflict Network's 1st Annual Workshop
Berlin, 15-16 January, 2006. <http://www.hicn.org/papers/callforpapersJan06.pdf>

Wetlands, Water and Livelihoods Workshop, January 30 - February 2, 2006, St. Lucia, KwaZulu-Natal province, South Africa. Contact details: Kemi Awoyinka or Maria Stolk, wetlands.livelihoods@wetlands.org

Feedback please!

Please take a moment to respond to these questions and then cut and paste them into an email and send to admin@khanya-aicdd.org . For questions 1. and 3. just delete those that don't apply to you.

1. Which describes you?
 - National/provincial government
 - Local government
 - International NGO
 - National/ Local NGO
 - Consultant
 - Academic
 - Student
 - Other

2. How many people do you send/forward this newsletter to?

How do you rate the newsletter on the following?
 - Quality of writing: excellent (1) readable (2) adequate (3) poor (4)
 - Content: excellent (1) informative (2) average (3) poor (4)
 - Length: about right (1) too long (2) too short (3)
 - Design: attractive (1) average (2) dull (3)
 - Themes covered: very relevant (1) relevant (2) irrelevant (3)

3. What topics would you like to see covered in forthcoming editions? Please indicate issues you would like to co-produce.

4. How can the newsletter be improved?

Past editions

These are available at www.khanya-aicdd.org

1. May 2001 The Sustainable Livelihoods Approach
2. July 2001 Community-based-planning
3. Sept 2001 Corporate Citizenship
4. Dec 2001 Rights-based approach to development
5. March 2002 Social capital and sustainable livelihoods
6. June 2002 HIV/AIDS and sustainable livelihoods
7. Sept 2002 Local Economic Development and sustainable livelihoods
8. Feb 2003 Institutional support for sustainable livelihoods
9. April 2003 Community-based Workers as a model for pro-poor service delivery
10. June 2003 Community-Based Natural Resources Management
11. Oct 2003 Sustainable Livelihoods and Gender
12. Feb 2004 Sustainable Livelihoods and Small Scale Mining
13. June 2004 Learnings about the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach
14. Sept 2004 Community-based management
15. July 2005 Shelter and livelihoods
16. Sept 2005 FAO's work on People-Centred Development with a Livelihoods Perspective (PCD-L)

Sustaining Livelihoods in Southern Africa is an initiative of the Khanya-African Institute for Community-Driven Development (khanya-aicdd). The editors are Ian Goldman, Khanya's CEO, and Rachel Searle-Mbullu, Khanya's Knowledge Manager. Ian can be contacted at goldman@khanya-aicdd.org, and Rachel at rachel@khanya-aicdd.org. Previous newsletters are available at the Khanya-aicdd website, www.khanya-aicdd.org.
