



Tanzania Forest
Conservation Group
Shirika la Kuhifadhi
Misitu ya Asili Tanzania



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

TFCG Technical Paper 48

Finding solutions to Community Based Forest Management governance challenges

By Dominico B Kilemo and Shukuru Nyagawa

Dar es Salaam

2021

This report was prepared by: Dominico B Kilemo and Shukuru Nyagawa



On behalf of the project:

Conserving Forests through sustainable, forest-based Enterprise Support in Tanzania' – CoForEST.

The goal of the project is to achieve a sustainable, pro-community natural forest management that transforms the economics and governance of the forest products value chains and contributes to climate change mitigation and adaptation.

The project is designed to achieve its overall goal through three inter-related Outcomes:

Outcome 1: The capacity of national, regional and local authorities and community members is strengthened to implement and scale-up CBFM in ways that diversify livelihoods and reduce deforestation.

Outcome 2: A supportive policy framework and financing mechanism for community based forest management and sustainable natural forest based enterprises is in place

Outcome 3: Research and learning institutions in Tanzania are generating new knowledge about enterprise oriented CBFM and are integrating this in student learning.

The project is financed by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation and is implemented by the Tanzania Forest Conservation Group in partnership with the Tanzania Community Forest Conservation Network (MJUMITA)

Recommended citation: Kilemo, D. and S. Nyagawa 2021. Finding solutions to Community Based Forest Management governance challenges. . TFCG Technical Paper 48. p. 26



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Objectives of the consultancy	2
2. Methodology	2
2.1 Desk review of relevant documents	2
2.2 Sample size and Sampling Strategy.....	3
2.2.1 Village level	3
2.2.2 District level	3
2.2.3 Regional level	3
2.2.4: National level	4
2.2 Key informant interviews.....	4
2.3 Focus Group Discussions	4
2.4 Data Analysis and Reporting	4
3. Key findings	5
3.1 Overview of CBFM Challenges in Tanzania.....	5
3.2 Skills shortages among VNRC members as a result of turnover of VNRC members ...	7
3.2.1 Root causes of skills shortage after turnover of VNRC members	7
3.2.2 Scale of the problem	8
3.2.3 Its impact on forest management	8
3.2.4 Recommended solutions	8
3.3 Impact on VLFRs when villages are sub-divided.....	10
3.3.1 Root causes of village subdivision.....	10
3.3.2 Scale of the problem	10
3.3.3 Impacts on VLFRs.....	11
3.3.4 Recommended solution.....	11
3.4 Municipalisation of villages	12
3.4.1 Root causes of Municipalisation of villages	12
3.4.2 Scale of the problem	13
3.4.3 Impact on the villages and the forests	14
3.4.4 Recommended solution.....	14

3.5 Delays by District Harvesting Committee in issuing forest produce allocation certificates	14
3.5.1 Root Causes of Delay	15
3.5.2 Scale of the problem	15
3.5.3 Impact to the villages	16
3.5.4 Recommended solution.....	16
3.7 Recommendations for future research.....	16
References	18
Appendix 1: List of stakeholders consulted	19

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Community-Based Forest Management (CBFM) is a forest management approach that takes place on village land. CBFM involves the establishment of Village Land Forest Reserves (VLFRs). VLFRs are managed by Village Natural Resource Committees (VNRC). CBFM is supported by the National Forest Policy of 1998 and the Forest Act of 2002. According to a recent survey, there are over 1,600 VLFRs in Tanzania, covering > 2.6 million hectares (FORVAC, 2021). These include both protective and productive VLFRs. In productive VLFRs, different forest products may be harvested including timber and charcoal. CBFM has proved to be a successful forest management model in reducing deforestation, and improving livelihoods and governance. CBFM has contributed to local government revenue collection and to community incomes that have been used to pay for social services such as health care, education and infrastructure.

CBFM has also faced a number of challenges. Four key challenges have emerged and are the focus of this study. These are:

(i) Skills shortages among VNRC members as a result of turnover of VNRC members – some VNRCs have struggled to fulfill their roles and responsibilities as members lack the necessary knowledge and skills. Turnover of VNRC members has contributed to this situation. For example, training may have been provided to VNRC members when establishing a VLFR. However, as members of the VNRC change over time, sufficient training is not being provided to new members. As a result, the collective skills and knowledge of VNRCs risks being eroded over time thereby undermining VLFR management. New approaches are needed that would ensure training is provided to incoming VNRC members.

(ii) Impact on VLFRs when villages are sub-divided: there is a common administrative practice for villages to be split into two or more villages, particularly when the population of a village has increased rapidly. This can result in uncertainty, and even conflict, regarding ownership, management responsibility and access rights for a VLFR. There is a need to understand this issue further and for guidance to be developed in addressing the challenges that can affect CBFM when a village is split.

(iii) *Municipalisation of villages*: Some villages with VLFRs have been incorporated into town councils, subsequent to the establishment of CBFM. This can result in the collapse of forest management and can lead to further deforestation. Unfortunately, there is no clear guidance and mechanism for effectively managing municipalization in a manner that ensure sustained forest management practices. There is a need to explore options and set in-place appropriate guidance and adequate mechanism for sustained forest management in a manner that will lead to avoidance of deforestation in VLFRs that are re-classified as falling in municipal areas.

iv) *Delays by District Harvesting Committees in issuing forest produce allocation certificate*: Some communities have experienced financial losses caused by delays in the District Harvesting Committees fulfilling their roles and responsibilities. This undermines communities' capacity to implement CBFM effectively. There is a need to conduct a compressive review of the existing procedures and mechanism set in-place for issuance of allocation certificates to determine the shortfalls and all the reasons that lead to such delays.

1.2 Objectives of the consultancy

- (a) To describe four governance issues affecting CBFM, including the nature and scale of the problems, their root causes and one or more case study per issue,
- (b) To generate evidence-based solutions to address the four challenges,
- (c) To prepare guidelines that address the four CBFM challenges, and.
- (d) To generate recommendations for further research around the four CBFM challenges.

2. Methodology

A mixture of methodologies and approaches were employed in performing various assignments/activities in this consultancy. These included the following:

2.1 Desk review of relevant documents

The consultants reviewed a number of literatures on CBFM in Tanzania with a view of understanding severity/ scale of each problem at national level.

2.2 Sample size and Sampling Strategy

2.2.1 Village level

The Consultants selected 7 villages (1 in Morogoro district and 6 from Kilosa district). At each village, the consultants conducted FGD and interviewed village leaders, extension officers and elite persons relevant for this study.

The consultants sampled the villages which represent one of the four key CBFM challenges namely; (i) Skills shortages among VNRC members as a result of turnover of VNRC members (ii) Impact on VLFRs when villages are sub-divided, (iii) Municipalisation of villages and (iv) Delays by District Harvesting Committees in issuing harvesting permits.

Table 1: Sampled villages

District	Sampled Villages	Forest area (ha)
Kilosa	Nyali	5,637.1
	Kisanga	10,545
	UlayaKibaoni	431.4
	Ihombwe	9,597.1
	Msimba	26,415.4
	Kitunduweta	2006.3
Morogoro	Matuli	1569.3

2.2.2 District level

At district level, the consultants conducted interviews with District Forest Officers, District Managers-TFS, District Land and National Resources Officers, District Land Officers and District Planning Officers.

2.2.3 Regional level

The consultants conducted interviews with officers from the regional administrative secretariat notably the regional natural resources officer and regional forest officer.

2.2.4: National level

Representative stakeholders from the MNRT, PO LARG, TAFORI, TFS, WWF, MCDI and FORVAC were consulted.

2.2 Key informant interviews

Key informant's interviews were used to elicit specific and in-depth information on the four issues stated in the ToR. Therefore, various stakeholders were targeted for key informant interview including: representatives of project stakeholders namely village leaders and community representatives, ward leaders, TFCG, MJUMITA, Tanzania Forest Research Institute (TAFORI), TFS, PO RALG, officers from regional administration secretariat and district officers. Other stakeholders included NGOs such as WWF, MCDI and the FORVAC programme. These interviews were conducted face to face and by phone.

2.3 Focus Group Discussions

The consultants conducted focus group discussion (FGD) with community representatives. In particular, FGDs were conducted with representatives of charcoal and timber producers and members of VNRCs.

The data from FGDs were recorded using notebooks and digital audio recorders to ensure no data is missed out. Topics for discussions focused on the four key challenges facing CBFM as highlighted in the ToR.

2.4 Data Analysis and Reporting

The qualitative data collected through FGDs and KII were analysed using ethnographic content analysis technique. This is the most commonly used method for analysing qualitative data. Data analysis using this technique involved breaking down and organizing the bulk of qualitative data into emerging themes consistent with the survey objectives, thereafter comparison of the emerging themes from the discussion to enable the researcher/consultant to draw conclusion from the individual and group responses of the respondents as guided by the key informants and FGDs interview guidelines.

3. Key findings

3.1 Overview of CBFM Challenges in Tanzania

The CBFM initiatives in Tanzania dates back in 1990s with the establishment of Duru-Haitemba Village Forest Reserve in Babati district. This forest reserve was the pilot project that proved success. It was the first village forest reserve in the history of CBFM in Tanzania (Kajembe et al., 2003). Between 1990 -2008 the Tanzanian government received financial support to facilitate CBFM activities from bilateral donors such as SIDA and DANIDA, leading to the establishment of 329 VLFRs (Lund, 2007). From 2009, there was a donor shift from state to non-state actors in supporting CBFM due to some bad experience with state authorities. For example, NORAD which supported the REDD initiatives; funded projects which were implemented by NGOs.

Non-state actors such as TFCG, MJUMITA, MCDI and WWF have played a key role in facilitating CBFM activities. MCDI has been supporting sustainable timber across CBFM villages in Southern Tanzania (Kilwa, Rufiji and Tunduru districts) while TFCG and MJUMITA have championed sustainable charcoal model in Morogoro region. WWF has been working with communities through MCDI, TFCG and MJUMITA. In Northern Tanzania, Carbon Tanzania is supporting communities to access carbon markets under REDD+ framework.

While turnover of VNRCs, splitting of the villages, municipalization of the villages and delays of District Committee in issuance of allocation certificates are the main focus of this study, literature review suggests that such problems are not adequately documented and calls for further research for generating more empirical evidence for the 4 issues. Table 2 below summaries an analysis of the reviewed literature against TOR.

Table 2: Summary of studies on CBFM challenges in Tanzania

Author (S)	Year	Selected CBFM challenges addressed	Relationship with 4 issues addressed by this study
Trupin et al.	2018	-Policy issues which seem to undermine CBFM operations in Tanzania - Dependence of donor funds - Markets for timber and charcoal - Internal capacity challenges (inability of VNRCs to combat illegal timber harvest)	Indirectly related
FORVAC	2020	Many issues requiring Government's interventions were addressed in the form of workshop resolutions and action points during CBFM Annual Stakeholders Forum	Indirectly related
Balama and Amanzi	2020	Limited technical and financial capacity of VNRCs to establish and run VLFRs	Related to shortage of skills as results of turnover of VNRC members
MCDI	2021	CBFM challenges in SULEDO community forest reserve in Kiteto district including changing of VNRC members without retaining the experienced ones in the new leadership term.	Directly related to shortage of skills as results of turnover of VNRC members
Camp et al.	2019	CBFM challenges in Tanzania and Bolivia	Indirectly related
TFCG	2020	The Potentiality of Urban Forestry in Lindi Municipal, Tanzania	Municipalization of VLFRs in Lindi Municipality

3.2 Skills shortages among VNRC members as a result of turnover of VNRC members

Shortage of skills among VNRC members as a result of turnover of the VNRC members is a common problem in CBFM arrangements in Tanzania whereby after every 5 years the leadership regime changes. The newly elected village chairpersons dissolve the existing VNRCs and formulated new ones.

The VNRC members are elected at sub village level after which the names are submitted to the Village Council. Once elected, the VNRC members during their first meeting elect their leaders namely chairperson, secretary and treasurer. Such leaders are then approved by the Village

Council which will subsequently submit their names to the village assembly for endorsement. The Village council has a mandate to nominate at least one member from the community to join VNRC.

Box 1: VNRC turnover in Matuli village, Morogoro district

This village is located in Morogoro rural district, Matuli ward. The new VNRC members were elected toward the end of 2020, whereby most of the members from the previous committee left. Despite the good work done by the previous leaders, there were some shortfalls from the chairperson, such that he was not re-elected. The new chairperson has very little interest on CBFM activities, the challenge has escalated as he has not shown any deliberate effort to revive or guide the VNRC group. The village council has decided to terminate his position in June 2021, to allow election of other member with capacity and

3.2.1 Root causes of skills shortage after turnover of VNRC members

The following are the identified reasons for skills shortage among members and turnover of VNRC members:

- a) **Failure of the CBFM guidelines to state the need to maintain some members from the outgoing committee:** The existing CBFM guidelines do not stipulate the requirement to retain some experienced VNRC members from the outgoing committee into the incoming committee. This has left the loophole for the village leaders to change VNRC members in the manner they wish leading to inconsistency and poor performance in forest governance.
- b) **Lack of good governance:** In some villages, the VNRC members selection process has been flawed, characterized by corruption and lack of transparency. Despite the fact that the sub-village leaders have the responsibility of ensuring a democratic and transparent selection procedure, still some of the members selected are those related to the leaders. The respondent from Matuli narrated that “*Those that can offer gifts and*

free beer or cigarette to the leaders have a high chance of winning the election, regardless of their capacity”

Conflict between the VNRC members and the village leaders also contributes to the turnover, especially when the VNRC leaders fails to obey the directives of the village chairperson or village executive officer.

- c) **Perceived benefits of the VNRC members:** The perception of the community members that VNRC members benefit financially makes the VNRC membership to be a competitive position. It has been a practice for the VNRC members to be paid some allowance when participating on various CBFM activities such as patrols and daily operations (i.e for the VNRC Chair, Secretary and Treasurer). For example, in Ihombwe Village the chairperson of VNRC is paid TZS 50,000 monthly while the secretary and treasurer are paid TZS 70,000/month.

3.2.2 Scale of the problem

This is a national problem in villages with VLFRs. The turnover of the VNRC members have been growing from time to time, making the problem big. For example, Matuli, Mlilingwa and Lilongwe villages in Morogoro rural district have experienced such a challenge. The same applies to Kilwa and Nachingwea districts whereby a number of villages with VLFRs have this problem. However, some attempts have been made by CBFM supporting NGOs to address this problem whereby at least one third of experienced VNRC members are retained. While MCDI has been providing CBFM support in Southern Tanzania (Coast, Lindi and Mtwara regions) , TFCG support to CBFM has been in villages within the Eastern Arc Mountain forests and villages in Morogoro region notably Kilosa, Mvomero and Morogoro districts. Furthermore, MJUMITA has been providing technical backstopping to villages with established VLFRs who are also members of MJUMITA across the country.

3.2.3 Its impact on forest management

In the absence of a well-coordinated and coherent VNRC with well-trained members, it becomes difficult to achieve the forest management targets of VLFRs. Therefore, it is imperative that the skills among VNRC members are sustained throughout the management operations of each village with VLFR.

3.2.4 Recommended solutions

The following are recommended:

- a) **Retaining at least half of the previous VNRC members:** Despite the fact that conducting election at every 3 or 5 years is part of their by-laws, it is recommended that new members should not exceed half the total number of the VNRC members, which

is critical for sustaining the institutional memory. In all the villages visited they have witnessed the challenges faced with the new members with limited knowledge, exposure and desire to achieve CBFM targets in respective villages. The study recommends that in each village, deliberate efforts should be made to ensure that at least half of the previous members are retained. The Village council has to lead in identifying VNRC members with capacity and readiness to work in the CBFM model; and advice respective sub-village leadership prior to selection process. It was noted in Nyali village that, some of the VNRC members selected have no interest in forest activities, they are not part of any group (i.e. charcoal or timber producers). It is important that the selected members should be engaging themselves in CBFM activities. This will enhance their understanding of the issues and dynamics and be able to linkup well with charcoal/timber traders, producers and government institutions. The position of the VNRC chairperson need to be filled by a person with adequate and broader knowledge about the CBFM activities, a person with integrity, and well respected across the village, and must have strong advocacy skills. The VNRC members need to set some goals and targets as to what they wish to achieve in a specific period of time, with well-defined and articulated Key Performance Indicators (KPI) for effective monitoring and evaluation of their achievement at the end of their tenure.

- b) **Support awareness raising trainings to new members on regular basis:** It was noted that VNRC members are currently receiving trainings from MJUMITA, which has been acknowledged very well by the village leaders. This kind of training should be conducted regularly with much emphasis on the importance of retaining some VNRC members for sustaining the institutional memory. MJUMITA should conduct Training of Trainers (ToT) and prepare simple training manual and package which can be adopted easily by fellow village members when conducting similar training. The village council will witness and confirm whether the training using local ToTs was conducted in their villages on quarterly basis.
- c) **Promoting good governance:** To strengthen good governance among community leaders it is recommended that, the selection process should be more transparent. The elected leaders should be monitored closely to avoid chances of corruption, misappropriation of the position and lack of accountability. They should sign a certain code of conducts document in which they declare allegiance to good governance ethics and principles.

3.3 Impact on VLFRs when villages are sub-divided

Splitting of the villages may sometimes happen as the need arise especially when the population of residents increases. A standard village has a minimum of 250 households. Thus, if a sub-village attains such number of household, it may request to establish a new village. It is common practice which is legally accepted according to the Local Government Act No 7 (1982).

3.3.1 Root causes of village subdivision

Population increase and political interests influence village subdivision, notably the interests of chairpersons of sub-villages to become chairpersons of the village and attain full authority to govern the village. Village subdivision increases the efficiency of social services delivery by the government. While there could be many causes of village subdivision, this study did not find evidence to support the proposition that the presence of a VLFR motivates the sub-villages to claim a village status and split from the main village.

3.3.2 Scale of the problem

Village splitting is a legal and common procedure which is practiced nationally in both CBFM and non-CBFM villages. Under CBFM framework village splitting has implications on the management arrangements of the VLFR and the validity of approved village land use plan and forest management plan especially in villages where the VLFRs are not gazetted yet. With the increasing population which requires additional provision of social services such as schools and health facilities, splitting of the villages is inevitable.

In this study two cases were identified in Kilosa district whereby the villages under CBFM model were split into two. These are Ulaya Kibaoni and Kisanga villages. Ulaya Kibaoni was split into Ulaya Kibaoni and Ng'ole but still share the VLFR while the Kisanga village was split into Kisanga and Wedo villages whereby the VLFR was also split. While the Kisanga village has adhered to the approved land use plan of the village including management of the VLFR as per approved management plan, the Wedo village changed their land use plan leading to a portion of VLFR falling under their jurisdiction being converted into farmlands. This is against the original land use plan and threatens forest conservation efforts. Although TFCG reviewed the land use plan and forest management plan for Kisanga which now excludes Wedo village, a portion of the forest which was taken by Wedo village and subsequently converted into farmlands contributed to forest degradation. Therefore, forest resources found in respective villages should not be divided for the sustainability purpose of these resources.

Table 3: Analysis of village sub division in Ulaya Kibaoni and Kisanga villages

Original Village	New villages	CBFM Experience
Ulaya Kibaoni	Ulaya Kibaoni and Ng'ole villages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The village forest is shared - All the forest management activities and committees (½ from each village) participate. - Have only one VNRC with members from both villages - All the decisions are done together - Equal distribution of 40% of revenues assigned for development activities (20% each village) - Prepared joint development plans <p>Challenge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordination of VNRC meetings is difficult. It takes long time for members from both villages to meet. This delays decision making
Kisanga	Kisanga and Wedo Village	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The VLFR is not shared - Wedo village decided to change the forest area to other land uses - The forest financial benefits remain with Kisanga village only - All the management responsibilities depend on Kisanga VNRC and its village government <p>Challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encroachment to the forest area from Wedo village side - Increases forest management responsibilities to Kisanga village

3.3.3 Impacts on VLFRs

Splitting of the villages poses a management challenge and may lead to forest degradation if meaningful interventions are not implemented especially in villages whose VLFRs are not gazetted yet. In such villages, splitting the village will mean nullifying the existing village land use plan and forest management plan because the village boundaries change. Given the fact that such arrangements may occur in the absence of a donor supported project, it is unlikely that the new land use plans and forest management plans will be developed. This will lead to mismanagement of VLFRs.

In villages with gazetted VLFRs, village splitting does not affect the forest since it is protected. The villages can split and still manage the VLFRs jointly. In particular, the VLFRs of TFCG supported villages under CBFM in Morogoro region have been gazetted. Thus any change of village boundaries will not affect the integrity of the gazetted village land forest reserves.

3.3.4 Recommended solution

There should be more awareness and education to communities and leaders especially political carder regarding forest resources to help them understand that this is a shared resource that need collective action. Therefore, any attempt to divide villages should not disturb forest conservation and management efforts. The established VLFR should be maintained and jointly managed by the villages after village sub-division. In particular, gazettelement of the VLFRs offers a permanent solution to this problem. Moreover, the villages

should be encouraged to make a study tour to SULEDO VLFR in Kiteto district which is managed by 11 villages.

3.4 Municipalisation of villages

3.4.1 Root causes of Municipalisation of villages

Like village sub-division, municipalisation of the villages is motivated by among others population increase and political interests. Politically, the decision is influenced by ward councillors who would push to have a town council with power to control revenues and other resources in the particular urban centre. Under the prevailing policy and legal frameworks, municipalization of villages with VLFRs calls for review of the Forest Act, 2002. According to

Conversion of VLFRs into cashew nut farms in Lindi municipality

Nandambi and Mkanga villages which were known to be in the Lindi Municipality ever since the start of the REDD project (the pilot project 2009 – 2014) but were included in the project due to the importance of the forests found in the village land. These villages were included in the project with conditions that the forests of over 7,000 ha would be conserved and protected for the present and future generations. Unfortunately, and contrary to the community agreement made during the REDD pilot project, these forests were given to investors who cleared them and planted cashew nuts.

Source: TFCG (2020)

the Act, VLFR is established on village land. Village land is governed by Village Land Act No 5 of 1999. It follows then that when the village is upgraded to township or included in municipality, the Village Land Act ceases to operate, instead the Land Act No. 4 of 1999 prevails. This implies that the land is changed from village land to general land. Furthermore, when the village is upgraded to township councils or included in the municipality, the status of village also changes to either hamlet or street. However, the Forest Act does not recognize hamlet or street forest reserves. It recognizes VLFRs only. While gazettment of VLFRs ensures their protection, by upgrading

the village to township council or including it in a municipal council the VLFR is automatically nullified since the status of the land changes.

The Tanzania Forest Act, 2002 recognizes “local authority” forest reserves. According to the Act, *local* authority means district authority or urban authority. This means the Act recognizes the district council, town council and municipal council, as well as district council forest reserve, town council forest reserves and municipal council forest reserve. However, the particular local authority must demonstrate its willingness to establish and sustainably manage such forest reserves. The process starts with designing a land use plan. Other procedures will follow until a forest reserve is established and gazetted. Uvinza district in Kigoma region, Tanganyika district in Katavi regions and Kilosa district in Morogoro region and are among the districts owning local authority forest reserves in Tanzania.

While it is expected that VLFRs whose ownership has changed from a village to a town or municipal council will become local authority forest reserves, some municipal /town councils may decide to change the land use of the forests into other uses hence jeopardizing the forest conservation efforts.

3.4.2 Scale of the problem

Although this problem can potentially occur to any CBFM village in Tanzania, there is still little information regarding the problem countrywide. In Lindi region, 8 VLFRs with a total of 26,580.87 ha (265.81km²) which were previously owned by the 8 villages under Lindi District were transferred to Lindi Municipality following the establishment of Lindi Municipal Council as per Government Notice 487 published on 26/6/2020 (TFCG, 2020). During the Advocacy workshop which was organized by TFCG and attended by different stakeholders including high level leaders and officers of Lindi municipality and Lindi region, it was agreed that since the VLFRs were gazetted, they will continue to be under the management of respective villages.

In Morogoro region, this study found two case study villages in Kilosa district where TFCG has been working in the past 10 years. Ihombwe and Msimba Villages are case studies demonstrating municipalisation of the villages whereby they have been annexed to Mikumi town council. Under this arrangement, the villages lost their village status, they are now regarded as hamlets in township settings. These villages are located far from Mikumi town, about 20 km. According to the respondents, the process of transforming these villages to town council began way back before commencement of the project. Township attributes were the key factors for the communities agreeing to join Mikumi township. Among others they expected the following:

- Expansion of investment opportunities especially in the area of tourism. These villages are located adjacent to Mikumi National Park
- Promotion of forestry related projects such as beekeeping.
- Strengthening of social services such as education, water and health.

Empirical evidence suggests that the town council is exploitative to Ihombwe and Msimba villages which were annexed to it. Firstly, the fact that such villages are located about 20 km away from the Mikumi town raises many questions regarding the motivation for such arrangement. Secondly, the villages have in the past 5 years received nothing from the Mikumi town council. Instead, the villages have been contributing some revenues to the town council.

3.4.3 Impact on the villages and the forests

Respondents in both villages showed greater concern over the future of the forests in these villages that they might be converted to other land uses. This is because the villages have no authority to make decisions regarding the forests. The decisions are now made by Mikumi Town Council. One respondent said *“At that time, there was little knowledge about CBFM and its advantages, otherwise we couldn’t have accepted this idea, we are worried about our forests and the revenue accrued since the decisions are now vested under the town council”*. Currently the process of forming a town council is at a very advanced stage, such that it is not possible for these villages to reverse it. They have made several attempts to retain their village status without any success.

3.4.4 Recommended solution

To address the challenges brought by municipalisation of the villages, the following are recommended:

- (i) Advocacy for the review of Forest Act 2002 to recognize hamlet or street forest reserves in urban settings;
- (ii) In case number (i) above fails or is delayed, it is recommended to sensitize town and municipal councils to which the VLFRs have been annexed to establish local authority forest reserves as per Forest Act 2002; and
- (iii) Awareness raising to the villages with VLFRs located nearby town centres on the consequences of joining the town or municipal council.

3.5 Delays by District Harvesting Committee in issuing forest produce allocation certificates

According to GN 417 published in May 2019, the process of allocation certificates begins at village level whereby the prospective applicants submit applications to the village in which a particular forest product (charcoal or timber) to be harvested is found. Upon receipt of the applications, the village council through the VEO organizes the village council meeting to review the applications after which the names of the applicants are submitted to the Village Assembly (VA) for approval. Once approved by the VA, the names are submitted to the DLNRO who will then forward such names of applicants to the TFS district forest manager who is a secretary of the District Harvesting Committee (DHC). Upon receipt of the minutes and names of applicants from the VEOs, the TFS district forest manager communicates with the District Commissioner (DC) who is a chair of the DHC to set a date for the DHC meeting. Once the DC has confirmed the date for the meeting, the TFS manager sends invitation letters to all committee members.

During the study in Kilosa district, it was learnt that sometimes, the allocation certificates are issued toward the end of August or early September. This means that the villages under CBFM are likely to lose revenues in the first quarter of the financial year.

3.5.1 Root Causes of Delay

The main root cause of the delay is GN 417 which has created more bureaucracy in issuance of forest produce allocation certificate, especially with the introduction of DHC which has removed the mandate of the villages to award forest produce allocation certificate to forest produce harvesting applicants. This is contrary to Forest Act 2002 which gives that mandate to the villages. Previously the villages had the mandate to review the forest produce harvesting applications and award forest produce allocation certificates based on their respective harvesting plans. Even with the establishment of DHC, GN 417 requires the chairperson of this committee to seek an approval from TFS chief executive before holding any meeting, this increases the bureaucracy.

Other causes for the delay in issuance of allocation certificates is attributed to the following:

- (i) Delay of funds to facilitate DHC meetings. The DHC meeting encompasses at least two representatives from all the villages that have submitted harvesting applications. Therefore, delay of funds to facilitate these meetings delays the subsequent processes. This meeting is financed by the Tanzania Forest Service (TFS) Services.
- (ii) Availability of the District Commissioner (DC). Given the role and responsibilities of the DC with multiple tasks and schedules, it is sometimes difficult find a time for DHC meetings. For example, it was reported that last year (2020) due to national election campaign and holidays, DHC meeting for Kilosa was delayed until late September 2020.
- (iii) Delays from the VEO in submitting the minutes and the list of applicants to the district authority. It was witnessed during the survey that some of the villages such as Ihombwe had not submitted these documents to the DLNRO yet.

3.5.2 Scale of the problem

Under the current regulations as guided by GN 417, the delays in issuance of forest produce allocation certificate by DHC is likely to affect many districts in the country. Because the GN 417 has led to inefficiency due to many procedures involved.

3.5.3 Impact to the villages

Delays of the allocation certificates reduce not only the timeline for traders to acquire and use the tree felling license¹, but also revenues of the villages. Furthermore, given the road conditions in most of the villages, the first quarter of the year (July – September) is the best time for forest harvesting because in the subsequent quarters fall in the rain season whereby the roads are not passable thus discouraging traders to go to the villages. Therefore, it is important that the forest produce allocation certificates are issued by July.

3.5.4 Recommended solution

The delays may be reduced if the following are implemented:

- a) Review of GN 417 with a view of giving back the mandate to award allocation certificates to villages;
- b) Awareness raising and education to the villages on the importance of reviewing the forest produce harvesting applications and submitting the required information to the district as soon possible.
- c) Advocacy at the district level especially DC office so that the DC understands the need to fast-track the process. The DC should be sensitized on the importance of delegating this activity to the District Administrative Secretary if not available rather than pushing the dates for the DHC meeting forward.
- d) In cases TFS is experiencing some financial constraints towards the costs for DHC meeting, the villages with established VLFRs should cover the costs of their participants.

3.7 Recommendations for future research

As highlighted in the study findings, the 4 issues studied are not well documented countrywide. While there are about 1,600 VLFRs in Tanzania distributed in different parts of the country with different socio-economic and socio-political backgrounds under which CBFM is operating, it is worth to explore more about the issues. In particular, future research should focus on the following:

- The impact of GN 417 on community forest product value chains,

¹According to GN 417, an application for felling license must be accompanied with forest produce allocation certificate. Therefore, a delay in obtaining the forest produce allocation certificate from DHC will also lead to a delay in acquiring the felling certificate.

- Action research involving the communities in testing different solution pathways for VNRC turnover
- Documentation of different experiences and lessons learnt on village sub-division in relation to CBFM countrywide
- The environmental, economic and social impact of the transition of CBFM to town/municipal forest reserve

References

- Balama, C.P and Amanzi, N.S. (2020). Proposed institutional Framework for the establishment of Community Based Forest Management (CBFM) Apex Body in Tanzania, a study commissioned by FORVAC.
- Camp, N.G.,Rodriguez,I., Martin, A.,Inturias, M. and Massao, G. (2019).The Type of Land We Want: Exploring the Limits of Community Forestry in Tanzania and Bolivia. Sustainability 11 (6) , 1643
- FORVAC (2020). Workshop Report: CBFM Annual Stakeholders Workshop: Contributions of Community Forest Management to Government Development Priorities
- Kajembe, GC, Monela, GC & Mvena, ZSK. 2003. Making community-based forest management work: A case study from Duru-Haitemba village forest reserve, Babati, Tanzania, in Policies and governance structures in woodlands of southern Africa, edited by G Kowero, BM Campbell & UR Sumaila. Jakarta: Center for International Forestry Research: 16–27
- Lund J.F (2007).CBFM and Village Revenue Collection in Iringa District. The Arc Journal Issue 21.
- MCDI (2021). Needs & Resources Assessment for CBFM Value chain Development Report-FORVAC Tanga Cluster.
- TFCG (2020). Advocacy Workshop Meeting Report : Potentiality of Urban Forestry in Lindi Municipal, Tanzania.
- Trupin, R., T. Morgan-Brown, H. Doulton and F. Nelson (2018). Making Community Forest Enterprises Deliver for Livelihoods and Conservation in Tanzania. Africa Biodiversity Collaborative Grou
- United Republic of Tanzania (1982). Local Government Act
- United Republic of Tanzania (1999). The Village Land Act
- United Republic of Tanzania (1999). The Land Act
- United Republic of Tanzania (2002). The National Forest Act
- United Republic of Tanzania (2019). The Forest (Sustainable utilization of logs, timber, withies, poles or charcoal) Regulations. Government Notice No. 417

Appendix 1: List of stakeholders consulted

National Level

Name	Institution
Sanford Kway	PO RALG
Seleboni John	MNRT – FBD
Alex Njahani	FORVAC
Dr. Severin Kalonga	WWF
Bernadetha Kadala	TFS
Charles Leonard	TFCG/MJUMITA
Kassim Ulega	MCDI
Dr. Numan Amanzi	TAFORI

Regional Level

Name	Institution
Joseph Chuwa	Regional Administrative Secretariat - Morogoro

Kilosa District

S/N	NAME	POSITION
1	John Mtimbanjayo	District Natural Resources Officer
2	Severine Gregory Chikuwa	Economist-district planning department
3	Dickson R Mliga	Land officer

NYALI VILLAGE

S/n	Name	Position
1	Vicent E Lusinde	Councillor
2	Omary M Kindahile	Chair person

3	Haleluya M Nehemia	VEO
4	DamasMahaza	Member of VNRC
5	Mapinduzi A Fumbi	VNRC Chairperson
6	Donald Kusenha	Member of VNRC
7	Ester Mgya	WEO
8	Yolam Simon MALIWA	Member of VNRC
9	Tekra Daniel	Member of VNRC
10	Emmanuel Dickson Maroda	Member of VNRC
11	Baraka K Mtweve	Member of VNRC
12	Ernest A Msule	Member of VNRC

Kitunduweta village

S/N	Name	Position
1	JaphetKageuka	Councilor
2	Ramadhan Said Pazi	WEO
3	Damas John	VNRC Member
4	Kenes S Malogo	VNRC Member
5	HappnesMapunda	VNRC Member
6	Leonist P Msozoka	VNRC Member
7	KulangwaGanda	VNRC Member

Ng'ole village

S/N	NAME	POSITION
1	Maulid M Simba	Chairperson –UlayaKibaoni
2	Upendo E Kipyali	VEO
3	Gervas M Ngilante	Chairperson –UlayaNg'ole
4	Joseph D Mwika	VNRC Member
5	SiaminIdd	VNRC Member
6	Tito Simon	VNRC Member
7	SalumJalala	VNRC Member

Mhenda village

S/N	NAME	POSITION
1	Pius G Mvula	Chair person
2	Vashty B Chimile	VEO
3	Enyasi Simon Makanda	VNRC member

4	Gasparry George	VNRC member
5	Exsavery Y Mhawila	VNRC member

Msimba village

S/n	NAME	POSITION
1	Imerda Ernest	VNRC Member
2	Omary A Amrani	VEO
3	Fred Benedict	VNRC Member
4	Bakari Said	VNRC Member
5	Kigunje A Kahawi	VNRC Member
6	Christian Rock	VNRC Member

KISANGA VILLAGE

S/N	NAME	POSITION
1	Hassan R Mbweli	Village chairperson
2	NyawebwaWamibwara	VEO
3	Robert P Kalale	VNRC Member
4	Shadrack S Mashishanga	VNRC Member
5	Gelard J Kisufi	VNRC Member
6	Amidu H Mbwanzu	VNRC Member
7	Haridi A Mahuma	VNRC Member

Morogoro District

S/N	NAME	POSITION
1	Wahida Beleko	District Natural Resources Officer

MATULI VILLAGE

S/N	NAME	POSITION
1	Martha Mgode	VEO
2	Remy Obasi	Acting Village chairperson
3	SalumMgunda	VNRC Member
4	KaswiraKazeze	VNRC Member
5	Jonas Ngoma	VNRC Member
6	ZawadiSalum	VNRC Member

7	Thobias Mohamed	VNRC Member
8	Zaina R Sanze	VNRC Member
9	AbdallahKassim	VNRC Member
10	Allen Onesha	VNRC Member
11	FatumaKarantin	VNRC Member
12	DottoNgodomi	VNRC Member
13	ZenaMagesa	VNRC Member
14	AshuraRajabu	VNRC Member
15	CosmasKidebe	VNRC Member