



AARHUS  
UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF  
COPENHAGEN

## **SCIFOR Project Science and Power in Participatory Forestry**



**PROCEEDINGS OF THE SCIFOR STAKEHOLDERS' FORUM**

Venue: TAFORI Conference Room, Morogoro, Tanzania

11 June 2015

## **1. Introduction**

Deputy vice-chancellor of SUA Professor Yonika Ngaga made the opening statements.

He related how this is the first of three stakeholder workshops in the SCIFOR Project and that he hoped to see many of the participants at all these three events as well as at the final national conference in 2017 where the results of the SCIFOR project will be presented.

The purpose of having annual stakeholder workshops is for the SCIFOR project to engage with those practicing participatory forestry directly – to inform about the project and to learn from those practicing in ways that can improve SCIFOR’s research and ensure that the project results are useful and will be put to use.

The point of this first workshop is to introduce SCIFOR and present the two PhD studies that will be undertaken within the frame of the project and get inputs to the research questions and approach. After these opening remarks, Dr. Sima Bakengesi, Director of Forest Production and Research at Tafari was invited to give her remarks as a host. She observed that about 48 million hectares (about 20% of Tanzania’s land) is under participatory forest management (PFM). She was confident that SCIFOR will contribute to improving PFM in Tanzania, including how best to involve communities in the management of these resources. She also underlined the value of exchanges between Tanzania and Nepal. Duru-Haitemba was the most studied case. But now, more cases are coming up. Dr. Bakengesi hopes that SCIFOR will make use of new statistics that are being published and will take note of the new forest policy about to be released. She also informed about availability of office space and conference services at TAFORI headquarters in Morogoro.

## **2. Presentation of the SCIFOR Project**

Project coordinator Jens Friis Lund, University of Copenhagen, presented the SCIFOR project. SCIFOR stands for ‘Science and Power in Participatory Forestry’ (<http://www.ifro.ku.dk/scifor>) and is a collaboration between Danish, Nepalese and Tanzanian researchers with backgrounds in forestry, anthropology and development studies. Key research questions are:

- What is the role of scientific forestry and other forms of knowledge participatory forest management (PFM)?
- What are the underlying rationales for the reliance on scientific forestry in PFM processes?

This research project involves four PhD studies, approximately 20 MSc theses, and related research that will use a mix of natural and social science approaches. The project runs from Jan 1, 2014 – Dec 31, 2017 and is financed by the Danish Consultative Research Committee on Development Research.

SCIFOR is motivated by the following issues:

- PFM implementation is inhibited by lack of funding for land-use planning and forest inventory and management planning.
- It is unclear whether management plans for PFM forests are based on rigorous and updated inventories.
- It is unclear whether PFM forests generate values that justify the costs of intensive inventories.
- It is also unclear whether actual forest management in PFM and other forests is based on inventory-based management plans.
- Unclear whether updated management plans exist and are in use for non-PFM forests.

The following table summarizes specific questions and proposed methods to answer these questions:

Questions	Proposed Methods
Do plans guide village-level and other forest managers' actual management practices?	Observations of actual management practices among foresters and villagers
Are management plans, based on rigorous and updated inventories, in existence for PFM and other forests?	Review of management plans, interviews with foresters and villagers, observations of management planning
How do resource constraints affect management planning?	Interviews with forest officers, NGOs, donors. Review of budgets and plans.
How do technical and procedural requirements for PFM affect inclusion and participation?	Observations and interviews with foresters and villagers
How do villagers and foresters perceive of forestry science and participation?	Interviews, observations and surveys with foresters, forestry students and villagers
How are foresters' values attributed to forestry science and participation shaped by (i) professional training and (ii) institutional incentives and socialization	(i) Review of teaching curricula, survey and interviews with first and last year forestry students, observation of teaching (ii) Observation and interviews with foresters at all levels and representatives of NGOs and donors

### 3. Experiences from the field

Participants were divided into two groups to discuss the following questions:

Question 1: Our preliminary research indicates that the procedures required for forest management planning under PFM are challenging. What are the challenges of elaborating management plans?

Question 2: Our preliminary research indicates that management plan may not fulfill their roles as guiding village-level forest managers' practical management. Are plans used or not and why?

Below is a summary of main points/answers to the questions from the discussions in each group.

**Group 1:** Rosemary (chair), Kimario, Makala, Lupala, Sungusia (rapporteur), Ngaga, Lund (rapporteur), Polimo

### **Question 1: Challenges of Elaborating Management Plans**

**Funding:** All agreed that funding is a huge problem. Funding is needed not only for preparation of the plans (surveying, mapping, land use planning etc) but also for oversight during implementation to ensure compliance.

**Capacity:** Communities are not able to develop plans on their own and always require technical facilitation. Even with capacity building and facilitation, villagers will never be able to create forest management plans on their own. Once you introduce how it is done and work with them to create a plan for one forest, you expect villagers to do it for another forest themselves. But that is not the case. We are dealing with people with low level of capacity. Furthermore, it is very difficult to make them understand the benefits/value of creating a management plan.

*Related to low capacity, have you thought of changing the concept? That is have you tried to simplify the plans?*

MCDI started with MNRT guidelines but these were found to be complicated and not very useful. MCDI has adapted the MNRT guidelines and developed a simpler guidelines iteratively, always seeking to simplify. They are now on the 3<sup>rd</sup> version. (Makala promised to share this version).

*Costs for inventory are arguably very high. For example, for a 5000 ha, it takes a team of experts not less than 10 days to do it thoroughly. How much confidence do you have in the plans?*

MCDI uses a transect based inventory method in which villagers count numbers of trees of certain species and, thereby, arrive at an estimate of harvestable volume. If they count 50 trees of mninga, enough to estimate harvest volume. Without oversight/supervision, villagers will try and rig the inventory exercise if there is no oversight.

**No training institution for PFM village forest guard** similar to Likuyu Sekamaganga and Pasiansi for the case of village game scouts. We just established PFM at the policy level and forgot about building the capacity of villagers to manage forest. There is nowhere villagers can go to learn how to control fire, for example. In response to this, Norway is supporting the establishment of such an institute plus a PFM library at FTI in Arusha.

## **Question 2: Are plans used or not and why?**

**Changing local leadership:** Changes to leadership leads to loss of knowledge. Also sometimes it's about politics – newly elected people do not want to take over the knowledge of the former leaders (or are not allowed to). [All agree to this statement]. Makala emphasizes that it's because of politics “every time you change leadership you need to build capacity again. It's a big challenge”.

**Ownership of the plans:** Communities do not own the plans and forests. Sense of ownership of the plan is low. “People even say ‘Ule msitu waliotutengea halmashauri/ the forest that was established by district council’. They are doing it “for the sake of doing” (perfunctorily), perhaps because they are not sure what to expect.

*How people involved in management plan preparation?*

Village council and VNRC are involved during surveying and taking measurements. Draft plan is prepared and presented to village assembly for comments. Comments received and redrafted. Problem is that you have involved leaders with the expectation that at village assembly more people will be there. Yet attendance is very low. And those who didn't attend don't feel ownership. Absentees fail to understand that management plan is their document and not NGOs document.

**Unclear mechanism for benefit sharing (also as an explanation to low sense of ownership):** From the beginning, villagers are not sure what they will get in the end. We want to involve them to protect and conserve the forest but at the end of the day they say how do we benefit? Villagers will always benefit from non-woody products but is that enough? We need means of supporting livelihoods benefits through PFM (especially JFM).

*Given the problem of ownership could one do away with the technical inventory to increase ownership?*

**No reference to management plans:** MCDI already simplified the inventory so people do transect walks to assess the forest (management planning in a very simple way). The problem is that when villagers get money they become greedy and forget about the plan. They do not refer to management plan when issuing permit. Even if they have a management plan saying that they can harvest 50 m<sup>3</sup> of mninga, they will give more to the buyer in order to get more money. If you leave them alone the forest will disappear within a few years. The need for technical support will be there forever.

To address this problem, MCDI conducts unannounced/surprise visits to the village to check whether villagers do patrolling as agreed – to check the forms etc. So the villagers don't always follow the plan in harvesting, patrolling etc. But when they know a monitoring team will be visiting, they try to do something to impress e.g. some patrols. To address the problem of not adhering to legal minimum diameter, facilitators should constantly check compliance to plan. For MCDI sites, FSC process is an added advantage as it confers a more rigorous monitoring to meet rather higher standards. There is also a mechanism to penalize non-compliance.

*To ease the burden of policing, why not let communities over-harvest and they will correct themselves once they realize the environment is being destroyed (let the system correct itself)?*

No. There is no way to leave communities continue on their own. It is important to follow-up. The idea of letting go and letting village politics play out to instate accountability and sustainable forest management was not accepted. But it was agreed that constant follow up by a third party is not sustainable, especially when it is depending on donors' support. To address this problem, communities are paying 5% of their income to the district and that is supposed to finance technical support. MCDI has developed a business model in which communities pay for MCDI services. MCDI asked and communities are ready to pay for services from three timber proceeds.

**Inadequate knowledge of the management plans:** When the plans have been made most villagers remain unaware of them even though they have been presented at village assemblies. Only VNRC and a handful more people who are directly involved with forest management in villages have a good knowledge of the management plans.

**Politics/Political interference:** Sometimes districts don't endorse plans. Why? The district may not have the money to convene the full council's meeting needed to endorse the plan. And there's no interest to make approval of management plans in ordinary councils' meeting. If the 5% royalty paid to the district is not mentioned in the plan, the district will look for tactics to delay approval of the plan. The agreement was, for some reasons, the district is capable of delaying approval of management plans.

MCDI: We advise the villages to voluntarily submit at least 5% to the district to keep good relations. "We have villages that earn 300 millions. If they won't share a bit of that it will be a problem".

**More on political interference:** "Political interference is very big. Our most successful village is now led by opposition party. It has 60.000 ha of forest and lots of money (make around 300 mill. per year). This village is rich but it is not supporting the ruling party. Now there was a letter from the Prime Minister saying that the border of the village has been changed so that the forest now belongs to the neighboring village, which is supporting the ruling party. Also, DC has been threatening NGO not to support this village and focus on the village supporting the ruling party.

The policy of creating laboratories for secondary schools leads to more harvesting. District commissioner endorses more harvesting to finance the building of these irrespective of the management plan.

*What happens to forests outside PFM and forest reserves? That is forest in general land?*

Forests on general land is for general use. They are called "mahitaji wazi" literally meaning "open uses" au "shamba la bibi". There is no proper management with a management plan etc.

In some areas, once there's nothing left on the mahitaji wazi, there has been tendency to change boundaries of VLFR so that some forests fall on mahitaji wazi.

In some cases where a strong environmental committee exist, forests on general land is well managed.

*How is this possible without management plan?*

Some villages put mahitaji wazi in a management plan and get the district council to approve the plan. Done this way, VNRC is also responsible for the management of general land.

Facilitators are also advising villagers that if a buffer zone is destroyed, there is no point of protecting a VLFR. In the future, villagers may want to expand VLFR. Thus, they will be ill-informed if they let forests on general land to be destroyed.

*Any examples of villages managing forests successfully without management plans and external support?*

There is one village in Ruangwa district and credits go the DFO for sensitizing villagers to manage forests. Village starting doing PFM in effect on their own, maybe inspired by neighboring villages participating in CBFM.

Another example is in Iringa: “We visited a village in Iringa. Iringa DFO thought there was no forest protection in that village and he recommended we visit that village because we were looking for a non-CBFM village. Village leaders told us that they have formed a VNRC. He also told us that they had seen MEMA villages that still have forest – and people started to come to their village to harvest trees. Villagers worried that the forest would disappear from their village and formed, even without support, their own VNRC.”

Another example of a village in Kondoa. The neighboring village of a village supported by AWF started conservation.

***Verdict:***

Management plans are partially (towards not) implemented.

*If partially and/or not implemented, do we still need them? With the simplification of inventory procedures, do plans still carry the same scientific rigor required to deliver SFM?*

Yes. Without management plans, it will be even worse. Forests will be destroyed at even a greater speed. There will be no basis for monitoring performance/for oversight.

Transect is one of the genuine methods for carrying out inventories. It's not really simplification. It is capable of generating sufficient data to support required statistical analysis.

*So, are management plans information tool or control tool?*

A control tool.

*But if villagers want to harvest more, they can forge meandering transects during inventorying process?*

This is yet another reason for why villagers should not be allowed to do inventories on their own. Statistics are really important when it comes to estimating level of harvest.

**Way forward:** To make CBFM sustainable, change villagers' mindset so that they develop sense of ownership of the process, the management plan, and the forest itself.

We must educate communities about the importance of forests to enable them to participate.

We must also consider the level of poverty existing in these villages. You cannot ask one to conserve forest if they do not have enough to eat.

Then, we need to think about other sources of income.

Group 2: Rwiza (chair), Meshack, Kigula, Numan (rapporteur), Christian (rapporteur), Mike (rapporteur)

#### **The PFM process:**

- Step 1: Get started = Identification of village/forest – Awareness creating (district to village level), identify village land for CBFM
- Step 2: Forest management planning (i.e. preparation of FMP through PFRA, prepare bye-laws), presentation to assembly for discussion and approval
- Step 3: Legalizing and formalizing the plans and bylaws , i.e. presentation of the plans to district council for approval
- Step 4: Implementation
- Step 5: Revision and gazettelement
- Step 6: expanding to new areas

#### **Question 1: Challenges of Elaborating Management Plans**

- Challenges of CBFM and JFM are different!
- Lack of resources and equipment; If this is government policy, why is government not bringing in funds to do PFM? Funds come mainly from donors. Budget of districts goes to other areas.
- PFM is a continuous process; does not fit with project schedule.
- There isn't much material benefits for the local community in CBFM => lack of interest



- Great need for awareness raising and training, but people shift after election; need to train new people
- MPs are not meant for harvesting; there is a need for an add-on in the form of a harvesting plan (“bye-laws are mainly don’t, not do’s”);
- Challenge with administrative set-up in village, some villages have VNRC, some VEC. The VEC is not so conversant with forest.
- Who to involve in plan? “VNRC members know everything, the rest nothing”. It is a challenge to involve everybody (elite capture), no time to involve everybody
- JFM: Reluctance to devolve rights and share benefits. Principles are there, but practice on the ground is different
- Many areas are declared as catchment areas/forest where no harvest is allowed, couldn’t this be changed? This again goes back to the facilitating
- Potential conflict between CBFR and with activities of TFS

#### **Question 2: Are plans used or not and why?**

- The availability of valuable forest products is a requisite of plan implementation, but also creates problems. Curse or blessing?
- Large variation in plan implementation
- If no incentive, implementation (e.g. patrolling)
- Conflict of interest; between VC and VNRC; politicians interfere
- “Villagers are not used to formal procedures”
- Cost of law enforcement (fines about 50,000 must go to the court) => expensive to implement
- Plans are sitting, not registered, not approved, project has stopped
- Translating monitoring results (GIS) into results that villagers can understand
- How is the cake (revenues) divided? Lack of accountability in cases
- DFOs are out of job? No revenues!

#### **4. PhD Studies under the SCIFOR Project**

##### **1. *Assessment of Local Communities’ Participation in Community Based Forest Management in Tanzania***

*Numan S. Amanzi, Sokoine University of Agriculture & University of Copenhagen*

This study seeks to assess levels of participation of different segments of local community in the CBFM at village level in Tanzania. Specifically, the study intends:

- To assess the level and determinants of participation of different segments of the local community during establishment of VNRC and demarcating VLFR;
- To examine how different segments of the local community participate in the forest management and harvesting planning;
- To assess how different segments of the local community participate in implementing FMP and whether their management practices comply with *de jure* FMP prescriptions and why; and
- To test existing participatory forest inventory and harvesting planning methods in order to recommend cost-effective and precise method.

To achieve these objectives, the study will employ a combination of methods including household surveys, PRA, participant observation, forest inventories, and in-depth interviews. On field inventories, the study intends to carry out field testing of the existing participatory forest inventory and harvesting planning methods. The study will contribute to the PFM debate and provide input to improve CBFM guidelines.

#### **Discussion/Questions:**

- What is the objective of involvement at the end of the day? Is it cost-effectiveness in monitoring or livelihood improvement?
- Selection of sites: Why don't you select two sites, one where worked well, one where not and find out why?
- PFRA guidelines are different depending on whether timber/charcoal or carbon? So can you compare them?
- You need to define better the term "participation" – what elements of participation are you interested in?
- What are the differences of household survey and semi-structured interview?
- Suggestion: In the site where PFM has been implemented for long, you should concentrate on interviewing those persons who have been involved for long?
- Can one selected village be considered to represent the vast Southern Highlands?
- Isn't it a problem to compare three different inventory methods which have very different aims?
- Aren't the two sites too different in conditions, making comparisons difficult?

## ***2. Understanding the Framing and Practice of Community-Based Forest Management in Tanzania***

*Eliezeri Sungusia, Sokoine University of Agriculture & University of Copenhagen*

This research focuses on describing scientific forestry principles in community-based forest management (CBFM) as spelled in the forest act and as they actually play out in practice, and explaining the technical framing and implementation of CBFM. Drawing on Bourdieu theory of practice/field, rational choice theory, and drawing inspirations from other key works, the study employs a combination of approaches as follows:

1. Examine forestry education/training - survey students, interview lecturers, participant observation (sit in forestry classes) at SUA.
2. Observation of interactions/ordinary practices between District Forest Officers (DFO) and communities. This will also involve interviewing officials and villagers. For this purpose, Eliezeri has chosen Rufiji District for its close proximity to Dar es Salaam as he will be required to move between sites i.e. the district and forest department headquarters in Dar es Salaam.
3. Of interest as well are interactions between DFO and officers working at the forest department headquarters in Dar es Salaam, and interactions with development partners and NGOs. On top of observing practices at the district level, he also intend to access and observe practices at the forest department headquarters in Dar es Salaam. He proposes to apply and work as an intern at the Rufiji District Council and/or TFS/FBD.

### **Discussion/Questions:**

- Why CBFM, why not JFM? The challenge is mainly with JFM! I would really like to see JFM to be part of this project!
- Why is the research focusing on participation, and not governance?
- If the goal is to learn about the framing of PFM, why don't you go to the "high level process"? I doubt it is done by SUA students!
- What do you expect to observe from FBD? It is not a place of implementation!
- Comment: I think it is better to do some interviews at TFS and FBD, you do not need to observe!
- Comment: Don't forget the training that is going on at FTI
- Comment: Observation/participation in day-to-day activities can add information that formal interviews cannot!

### **5. Closing**

Stakeholders declared their interests to the project and they are looking forward to see the findings. They promised their support for the successful implementation of the project. Project leadership promised that stakeholders will be invited again half-way in the implementation of the project to receive and discuss preliminary findings/progress report and possibly towards the end of the project for actual findings. It is the desire of the project participants to involve stakeholders at all stages of project implementation and ensure that this project actually contribute to improving practices in participatory forestry in Tanzania.

<b>Appendix: List of Participants</b>				
<b>S/N</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Contact</b>
1	Anatoly Rwiza	FO/DEMO	BABATI -DC	Address : P.O. Box 400 Email: anatoly-rwiza@yahoo.com Tel. No: 0784 42 16 69
2	Mwaikenda T. Dodan	Head of Beekeeping Unit	Mvomero - Dc	Address : P.O. Box 663 Email: tufened@yahoo.com Tel. No: 0784 52 41 86
3	Makala J.L.	CEO	Mpingo Conservation & Dev. Initiative (MCDI)	Address : P.O. BOX 49, Kilwa Email: jasper.makala@mpingoconservation.org Tel. No: 0784 93 80 97
4	Numan S. Amanzi	PhD Student	University of Copenhagen and SUA	Address : Box 3013 SUA MOROGORO Email: numansaid@yahoo.com Tel. No: 0713 42 48 35
5	Prof. Y. M. Ngaga	Ass. Professor	Sokoine University of Agriculture	Address: Box 3011, Morogoro Email: yngaga@yahoo.co.uk Tel No. +255 767 26 36 46
6	Christian Pilegaard Hansen	Ass. Professor	University of Copenhagen	Address: Rolighedsvej, Frederiksberg Denmark Email: cpheifro.ku.dk Tel. No: + 45 61 66 27 46
7	Michael Eilenberg	Assoc. Professor	Aarhus University	Address: moergoad Alle 20 AARHUS, Denmark Email: etnome@cAs.au.dk Tel.No: + 45 29 72 04 74
8	Dr. Siima S. Bakengesa	DFPR -	TAFORI	Address: Box 1854, TAFORI Morogoro Email: siima.bakengesa@taforitz.org Tel No: + 255- 754 78 45 45
9	Sosthenes Paul Rwamugira	Conservator	Uluguru Nature Reserve	Address: P.O. Box 1020 – Morogoro Email: rwamugirasosy@yahoo.co.uk Tel. No. + 255 784 35 74 54
10	John N.M. Kimario	Ag. District Forest Manager Morogoro District	Tanzania Forest Services (TFS)	Address: P.O. Box 1020 Morogoro Email: yhani.kimario@yahoo.com Tel: No: +255 784 73 68 52
11	Rosemary Boniphace	FPO – EAMCEF Southern Zone	EAMCEF	Address: P.O. Box 2324, Kilolo Email: rosemaryboniphace@yahoo.com Tel No: 0688 09 05 99
12	Jens Friis Lund	Associate Professor	University of Copenhagen	Address:ROLIGHEDSVEJ 25, 1958 FREDERIKSBERG DENMARK Email: JENS@IFRO.KU.DK Tel. No. 0686 27 86 55/ + 45 2062 7706
13	Joachim S. Mshana	Ag. District Forest Officer	Iringa DC	Address: Box 108 Iringa Email : mshanajos@hotmail.com Tel No: 0767 35 29 68

14	Lupala John Zakaria	PFO	FTI Arusha	Address: P. O. Box 943 Arusha Email: zachlupala@yahoo.com Tel No: 0757 35 82 78
15	Joseph Johnson Kigula	PFM Coordinator	TFS/FBD	Address: P.O. Box 40832 Dar es Salaam Email: jjkigula@yahoo.co.uk Tel No: +255 784 46 80 43
16	Eliezeri Sungusia	PhD Student	University of Copenhagen and SUA	Address: Email: elysung@gmail.com Tel No: 0786 43 44 400
17	Charles Meshack	Executive Director	TFCG	Address: Email: cmeshack@tfcg.or.tz Tel: No: 0754 – 38 06 0 7