

CO-CHAIRS' SUMMARY REPORT

Tanzania Land Use Dialogue (LUD)

Sustainable Landscape Planning in the
Ihemi Cluster

JUNE 12-15, 2017 – TANZANIA



Introduction

Southern Tanzania can be considered the breadbasket of the country due to the region's concentration of agricultural activities, numerous fresh water resources, and high soil productivity. Southern Tanzania is also known for its biological diversity and wildlife populations found in the Selous Game Reserve (SGR) and Ruaha National Park (RNP). The region is targeted for rapid and sustainable agricultural growth through the Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania (SAGCOT) initiative. The introduction of the SAGCOT initiative, coupled with existing agricultural activities and other land use needs such as forestry, grazing land, and commercial activities, is exerting excessive pressure on land and other natural resources in the region. A participatory and integrated approach is needed to reconcile the different land needs and uses in pursuit of sustainable landscapes, economic growth, and sustainable livelihoods.

The Land Use Dialogue (LUD) initiative aims to create ongoing stakeholder engagement platforms to support the implementation of a landscape approach in various landscapes throughout the world. The LUD in Tanzania has established a multi-stakeholder platform in the Ihemi cluster designed to build consensus on sustainable management of land and resources. The LUD seeks to explore and, where possible, reconcile stakeholder perspectives and priorities in the landscape while supporting the identification of programmatic solutions. To support sustainable and inclusive agricultural growth in the region, the LUD identifies existing institutional structures, national and sub-national policies, local institutions, and technological innovations relevant to the platform's goals in the Ihemi cluster.

The second LUD meeting in Tanzania was designed to build on outcomes of the first LUD meeting held in November of 2016 in Iringa. The overall objective was to deepen discussions by key stakeholders on land use and land use management

LUD • Yale University, New Haven, CT, U.S.

O: +1 203 432 5966 • T: @forestsdialogue • info@theforestsdialogue.org • W: www.theforestsdialogue.org

SAGCOT • TSPF Building Mwaya Road, Masaki, P.O. Box 11313 • Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

O: +255 (0) 22 260 1024 • M: +255 655 691 510 • info@sagcot.com • W: www.sagcot.com

for the sustainability of land resources, food security, and economic growth. The four main priority actions identified from the first dialogue were: focus on participation and inclusion of actors in the landscape, develop a common understanding of inclusive green growth, enhance collaborative platforms, and make efficient use of resources such as soil, land, water, wildlife, and rangelands. As a way to build on knowledge sharing with a focus on the priority actions identified during the first LUD meeting, the second LUD had the following objectives:

- Continue to develop a neutral multi-stakeholder platform in the Ihemi cluster with short-term and long-term goals of the process including sustainable land use, food security, and improved livelihoods.
- Build shared understanding of existing platforms and stakeholder initiatives related to land use and land use planning through mapping.
- Create a shared vision of the landscape through experiential field visits and dialogue.
- Deepen understanding of land use plan implementation in the landscape including identifying gaps in facilitation and key priority issues.

The dialogue covered three days of field and plenary sessions supported by breakout sessions. It drew a total of 83 participants representing the government, civil society organizations, private sector, smallholder farmers, and community representatives. The dialogue was co-chaired by Jennifer Baarn (SAGCOT Centre Limited), Michael Nkonu (IUCN) and Mary Ndaro (Care International). This co-chairs' summary highlights the key activities of the dialogue and reports the findings.



Co-chair, Mary Ndaro, at Mkongea Tea Block Farm

Context: Ihemi Cluster

Located in the eastern-most part of the southern highlands, the Ihemi cluster (“Ihemi”) is one of Tanzania’s agricultural strongholds and an important region for forest and agricultural production. An estimated 73% of the land is arable with about 47% currently under cultivation. The SAGCOT initiative has divided the region into six ‘clusters’ meaning groupings of agricultural activities and infrastructure. Ihemi is at the center of the SAGCOT initiative as the priority cluster. While the SAGCOT initiative has succeeded in bringing agricultural investments to Ihemi over the past three years, the key concern is ensuring that the rapid agricultural growth is green and inclusive.

Agricultural development in the area, therefore, requires addressing challenges of water scarcity, climate change vulnerability, and sustainable production capacity. One such challenge within the Ihemi cluster is more frequent drying of the upper basin of the Ruaha River catchment. Competing demands for the Ruaha’s water abound due to large regional population, important wildlife areas, and highly productive irrigated agriculture downstream. The majority of the people (70-90%) outside of Iringa, an urban district located within Ihemi cluster, engage in agriculture-based livelihoods, yet few have efficient irrigation systems to sustain commercial production.

Village Land Use Planning (VLUP) is a system introduced by the government under the Village Land Act No 5 of 1999 to secure smallholder tenure, designate conservation areas, and identify areas for investment within villages. So far, out of 94 villages under the Kilo district land council, only 40 have developed Land Use Plans (LUPs). When done in a participatory way, with free, prior, and informed consent, land use planning is generally considered to increase the local people’s ability to invest in their land, to attract investors, and promote environmental management. Varied levels of participation can lead to wide differences in the way the community perceives the benefit and impact of the VLUP, in some cases leading to conflict and community rejection of the VLUP.

Reflections on the First LUD Meeting

One of the priority areas highlighted in the first LUD meeting was the need to better involve all actors in the landscape process. An exit survey administered at the first LUD meeting to evaluate the effectiveness, neutrality, content, stakeholder involvement, and the relationships established confirmed this gap. When asked if all relevant stakeholders are represented in the LUD platform, 44% of the respondents agreed, while 27% disagreed. Respondents felt it was necessary to have representation from pastoralists and village leaders.

Despite a majority of the respondents agreeing that there was room for all stakeholders present to participate and be heard in the dialogue process, it was noted that language and funding were the main constraints to achieving full participation. Most respondents



Dialogue session in Iringa, Tanzania



Dialogue participants gathered for breakout session presentations



Dialogue participants during breakout group session



Co-chair, Michael Nkonu, presenting results from breakout session

agreed that platform members have the necessary skills and knowledge to participate in the dialogue, though it can be improved through additional information and discussion on the following themes: gender issues, community development, indigenous knowledge, and business management.

Outcomes of the Field Visits and Plenary Discussions

The field visit covered two districts, Mufindi and Kilolo, which provided an overview of the variable and multiple land uses, illustration of successful and unsuccessful land use planning, and examples of the issuance of the Customary Certificate of right of Occupancy (CCRO) within the cluster. The actors involved included government ministries and agencies (national and local), smallholder farmers, local and international civil society organizations, private sector with specific interest in land, land use planning and management, and small-scale producers including pastoralists. The key reflections from the field visits and plenary discussions were as follows:

Participation and Inclusiveness

While there are existing guidelines on how to involve the community in the land use planning process, their engagement remains limited. Identified reasons for this include: a largely top down rather than bottom up process; limited resources set aside by the government resulting in a process heavily dependent on donors; unclear expectations, benefits, and tradeoffs by the community. Stakeholders pushed that community ownership to the process will require an assessment and understanding of the community to actively participate in the process and involvement from the initial stage so that they can make informed decisions. Other groups identified as absent from the planning process include research institutions and technical experts such as spatial planners and GIS specialists.



Co-chair, Jennifer Baarn, leading a breakout group session

Resource Efficiency and Land Use Plans

It was observed that ongoing VLUPs are currently missing vital components to sustainable and inclusive growth including the efficiency and sustainability of natural resources. The identified limitations to the realization of resource efficiency in the landscape included: poor coordination on natural resource management, weak enforcement of the existing policies, and limited access to technical capacity for efficient use of resources by the communities. Suggestions on how to improve resource efficiency included: coordination of ongoing initiatives by different actors on the landscape to reduce replication of activities, setting up guidelines on land use changes in the landscape, and linking the land use planning to the long-term benefits of the communities.

Additionally, biodiversity considerations and socio-economic components were notably lacking from the VLUPs.

Landscape Management for Inclusive Green Growth

Currently, the land use planning process is at the village level, which does not capture the larger context of the landscape, risking creating problems in the future. Furthermore, the community perceives the process as constraining their economic activities (as was observed in the case of limitations on wetland cultivation) and lacking a structure to define resource allocation among different actors involved in the land use planning process.

From the stakeholders' perspective there is a need to: employ the landscape approach to provide a larger context for the LUP, find means of enforcing the laws in a manner that does not compromise the economic stability of the various communities, ensure equal opportunities and capacities for men and women, provide a structure for sharing of benefits accruing from the existing natural resource,; and create networks with commercial actors to support actions of smallholder farmers through market and farm inputs.

Sustainability of Landscape Management

The sustainability of landscape management depends largely on the availability of resources and the model employed to carry out the process. Given the process has been heavily dependent on donor funds, there is a need to strengthen the internal capacity and find ways of generating resources to ensure its continuity. In terms of model, a programmatic approach rather than project approach to landscape management offers more sustainability to the process by ensuring its lifetime is not limited to that of a project. It was also noted that Public Private Partnerships offer an opportunity for sustainability by initiating collaborations between commercial actors and the communities. The only limitation, however, is the weak enforcement of the existing policies.



Dialogue participants gathered for breakout session presentations



TFD Executive Director, Gary Dunning, introducing LUD initiative



Dialogue participants at Mtanga Farm.



Dialogue participant, Chris Buss, asking a question about the landscape

Other important considerations for achieving sustainability involve harnessing the indigenous knowledge of natural resource management and thinking beyond land use in the landscape to other issues such as waste management in the timber industry and pollutants resulting from agricultural activities, among others.

Way Forward

Through plenary dialogue and field visits, the following seven key issues were identified as priorities in the landscape. Key actors were identified to indicate that they are already leading efforts on these activities or their participation is considered integral to achieving that action.

Enhancing Inclusiveness

From the discussion, it is clear that inclusiveness remains key to the success of the landscape approach given the varied stakeholders engaged. There should be mapping of all stakeholders involved in the landscape and a clearly defined leadership structure to increase efficiency. In addition to the ongoing stakeholder mapping process, the following actions should be undertaken:

- ➔ Engage and involve businesses, academia, and research institutions in the VLUP process
- ➔ Improve efficiency through properly coordinating initiatives and reducing the replication of activities.
- ➔ Develop a holistic approach to landscape implementation in the Ihemi cluster. This can be led by the National Land Planning Commission (NLPC) in collaboration with SAGCOT Centre Limited. The NLPC can identify all the actors in the landscape and their shared action plans for points of collaboration.

KEY ACTORS: National Land Planning Commission, CSO's such as HakiArdhi, PELUM, Care International

Initiating Public Private Partnership (PPP) Processes

Public Private Partnerships have the potential to catalyze economic growth among the communities in the landscape. From the discussion, it is clear that there are policies in place regarding Public Private Partnerships, however, their enforcement remains quite weak. For a robust process, there is the need to:

- ➔ Create linkages between the community and existing businesses such as the timber factory
- ➔ Strengthen the enforcement of the existing policies on Public Private Partnerships

KEY ACTORS: Investors and Businesses, Communities, SAGCOT

Focusing on Landscape-Scale Planning

The ongoing LUP is primarily focused on the villages as the basic unit. Yet village level planning does not ensure land uses are planned sustainably at the landscape level. There remains a need for a model of a functional and sustainable land use planning approach. Moving forward, the following actions will be necessary in shifting the focus from the village level to a broader scope:

- ➔ Develop a sustainable landscape demonstration site to be used as a basis for modelling other landscapes.
- ➔ Develop the tools and models for monitoring and evaluating land uses changes and inclusive green growth.
- ➔ Develop maps of the landscape, overlaying biodiversity with socio-economic information to support efficient resource use.
- ➔ Employ a programmatic approach rather than project approach to landscape management

KEY ACTORS: Ministry of Land and Planning, Academia-GIS experts, SAGCOT, CSO's, Donors e.g USAID, Conservation Agencies e.g. AWF, WWF

Creating Synergy with Other Platforms

There is a great necessity to maintain a neutral and functional platform for the landscape approach. This is possible by building on the existing platforms such as the SAGCOT Green Reference Group to bring stakeholders together and share knowledge and experiences. The Forest Dialogue's LUD should not replace local dialogues but rather enhance them by providing an umbrella platform that captures the corridor lessons. The key actions include:

- ➔ Identify and evaluate the existing platforms on the landscape.
- ➔ Align the relevant platforms to Inclusive Green Growth.

KEY ACTORS: SAGCOT, National Land Use Planning Commission, IUCN

Building Education and Awareness

Among some communities there is a lack of understanding of the ecological and economic benefits to sustainable landscape management. This remains a major hindrance to the success of the LUP, as was observed in the case of the Mawambala Village (see full details under the field descriptions in annex C). This limits their participation in the process, resulting in greater resistance to LUP. The following actions are vital for engaging communities in the LUP process:

- ➔ Assess and understand the capacity of the local communities so that they can actively participate and have ownership of the process.
- ➔ Inform the community on the land use planning process, both in the short term and long term.
- ➔ Undertake joint mobilization of resources for sustainable land use planning.
- ➔ Provide access to technical capacity for the communities to enable efficient use of resources.



Dialogue participants with residents of Mawambala Village



Field visit to Kihesa Mgagao Village



Asking questions at Mkonge Tea Block Farm



Landscape in Mufindi District of Tanzania

KEY ACTORS: CSO's such as TAGRODE, PELUM, HakiArdhi, District Land Use Planning Committee, National Land Use Task Force

Using Maps and Models in Monitoring and Evaluation

In tracing the land use changes in the landscape, maps remain a necessary tool. Static maps and plans, however, offer little room for comparisons. This necessitates the need for periodic updates. In addition to maps, different spatial models could also be developed and used in determining the best land use plans for a given landscape. To undertake an effective evaluation the following actions are needed:

- ➔ Develop maps for the landscape indicating the existing biodiversity, population distribution, and the economic status as a benchmark for evaluating changes.
- ➔ Foster collaboration among stakeholders to develop tools, maps, and different models for the LUP.
- ➔ Develop revenue generation strategies (e.g. land rates/rents) to ensure that the maps and models are continually updated.

KEY ACTORS: Academia, CSO's, Ministry of Land and Planning, Research Institutions

Ensuring Individual Growth Relates to Landscape Growth

A sustainable landscape approach ensures that the communities within the landscapes experience marked growth. While broader growth is important, it is vital that every individual benefits from the process. The process should not be a constraint to an individual's economic growth but rather an empowerment. For this to be feasible the following actions are key:

- ➔ Link communities with investors on the landscape through Public Private Partnerships.
- ➔ Create networks with commercial actors to support smallholder farmers, for example through markets and farm inputs.
- ➔ Develop a benefit sharing structure for the community to ensure that no particular group benefits more than the rest.

KEY ACTORS: Communities, Investors/Business, Government Ministries-Agriculture and Livestock, Natural Resource Management, Industry and Trade

Acknowledgements

In addition to the individuals who took part in the field dialogue, the co-chairs wish to thank the following organizations for their support in hosting or sponsoring the dialogue: International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the SUSTAIN Program, SAGCOT Centre Limited and The Forests Dialogue (TFD). A special thank you to Beryl Ajwang' of The Forests Dialogue for producing the first draft and working with the co-chairs to finalize this summary.

Annex A – Learning Questions

The following learning questions were developed by TFD and the co-chairs and distributed to participants prior to the dialogue. The questions are designed to stimulate thought around the landscape approach and role of the LUD in the landscape throughout the dialogue meeting. The following answers to the learning questions arose from discussion during the field visit and plenary sessions.

1 What are the specific concerns about the current trends for land and resource use/management in the landscape? How do the current trends benefit specific sectors? What are the impact on other sectors and the environment?

- ➔ The specific concerns about the current trends for land and resource use/management in the landscape include the missing link between efficiency and sustainability of natural resources in the ongoing VLUPs, poor coordination on natural resource management, weak enforcement of the existing policies, and limited access to technical capacity for efficient use of resources. There is also a need to factor in the biodiversity and the socio-economic components into the planning process.
- ➔ In some cases, the communities felt the natural resource management in the landscape was a constraint on their economic livelihood. This was evident in the implementation of the water policy that required no cultivation in at least 60 meters from the river bank. These areas, however, remain the most productive zones and serve as the major source of livelihood for these communities. The result is a reduction in the production of food and direct household income.
- ➔ There is no clarity on how benefits should be shared in and between the communities—in particular the upper and lower users of the water resources.
- ➔ Another observed concern is the lack of structure in place to define resource allocation among different actors involved in the LUP process.

2 What is your vision for a sustainable and thriving landscapes in 15 years? What opportunities do you see as possible in the landscape? What are the limitations to reaching this vision? What are the most important priorities in the landscape?

OPPORTUNITIES

- Community involvement in the VLUP process
- Engage and involve businesses such as factories in the VLUP process
- Create linkages between the community and existing businesses such as the timber factory
- Undertake planning for the other remaining villages—only 40 out of 94 have been done
- Environmental conservation
- Access loans using the CCRO's

- Existence of various policies and statutes on natural resource management and landscaping both at the national and local level
- Existence of several actors e.g. CSOs in the VLUP
- Existence of research institutions and universities
- Ownership of land by women and youth through CCROs
- Economic investments, ranging from forestry to farm products.

LIMITATIONS

- Lack of alternative livelihoods for households who live on wetland cultivation
- Existing traditional land tenure in the redistribution process during the planning process
- Ignoring advice from technical experts
- Lack of collaboration between the stakeholders involved such as government and the private sector
- Weak enforcement of the existing landscape planning policies
- Poor governance of natural resources
- Inadequate awareness by the community on land use planning
- Inequality in sharing of the benefits accrued
- Poor coordination on natural resource management
- Unharmonized policies; they are not coherent
- Inadequate feedback from the research institutions
- Budget constraints
- Few institutions involved in landscape/ land use planning
- Inadequate material support from the government especially the district council
- Conflict of interest among community members
- Unresolved state of affairs between the ideal land use planning and the reality of how land use affects communities.

ACTIONS

- Full involvement of stakeholders from the initial stages of the process
- Capacity building and availing of resources for sustainable land use planning
- Identification of existing technologies as a means of providing alternative livelihoods

- Sensitization of the community on the land use planning process, both in the short term and long term
- Involve other stakeholders from different regions/clusters for support
- Strengthen and make government accountable
- Enforcement of policies in line with land planning and management
- Strong coordination on natural resource management
- Put the 4ps into action-Private Public Partnership Policy-which is very weak in terms of its enforcement
- Continuance of the CCRO's
- Establish exchange programs for farmers on sustainable landscapes
- Participatory approach in land use planning following the six steps of land use.

3 **What action (ones that already exist or need to be created) could deliver or support the vision for a sustainable and thriving landscape? Where in the landscape would they need to happen? By whom? What kind of investments are needed? How does the land use planning process impact the vision?**

For sustainability in the landscape, the following actions will be needed:

- Employ a programmatic approach rather than project approach to landscape management to ensure the lifetime of the process is not equivalent to that of a project.
- Strengthen the internal capacity and find ways to generate resources for the LUP process to ensure its continuity.
- Focus on a broader context of the landscape planning rather than VLUP.
- Harness indigenous knowledge of the community on sustainable natural resource management.
- Initiate the Private Public Partnership processes as a potential opportunity for commercial actors to collaborate with communities in sustaining the process.
- Think beyond the land use in the landscape to other issues such as managing contamination and pollution from timber and agricultural activities.

4 How do the field sites visited display opportunities or challenges to attaining the vision? What lessons can be learned?

From the field visits it was evident that:

- The land use planning process does not always fully involve the communities, in some cases due to financial constraints. However, there is a need to involve the community from the initial stages so that they can make informed decisions. One way to improve the process would be to reduce dependency on donors by finding alternative means of to raise the funds.
- There is a need to create a case for the land use plans in terms of the expectations, benefits, and tradeoffs by the community. As in the case of the 'wetland cultivation', there is a need to understand the relevance of the policy and the direct and indirect benefits that will be accrued from the process by the community.
- There are ongoing land use changes in the landscape including conversion of croplands into tea farms or into forest land. It is important to evaluate the impact of these changes on resource efficiency in the landscape.
- There is a lack of a benefit sharing structure for the community to ensure that no particular group benefits more than the rest.
- There are various land use planning policies in place, however, their enforcement remains weak and there is a need for harmonization.
- There is a lack of collaboration between the stakeholders involved such as government and the private sector.

Annex B – Participants List

John Ajjugo	HOAREC
Beryl Ajwang	The Forests Dialogue
Valence Arinaitwe	Forest Sector Support Department/REDD+ Secretariat
Andrea Athanas	Africa Wildlife Foundation
Jennifer Baarn	SAGCOT
Geoffrey Bakanga	FAO Tanzania
Daryl Bosu	A Rocha Ghana
Chris Buss	IUCN
Lydia Chingioro	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries
Christian Chonya	WWF Tanzania
Amity Doolittle	Yale University/The Forests Dialogue
Gary Dunning	The Forests Dialogue
Santino Edison	Mkonge Tea Farm
Joyce Engoke	HOAREC
Makfura Evergris	WWF Tanzania
Elizabeth Felker	The Forests Dialogue
Gidufana Gafufen	Health, Environment and Livelihood Partners
Paul Giesen	PBL Netherlands
Maria Ijumba	SAGCOT
Rhoda James	Multi Actors Integration (MAI)
Ferimoni Kagine	Kiheso Mgagao Village
Richard Kapere	Uganda Wildlife Authority
Michael Kaunga	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries
Filbert Kavia	Njombe Out-growers Service Company (NOSC)
Estelina Kihonza	Mawambala Village
Jackson Kiplagat	WWF Kenya
Elinaza Kiswaga	Kilolo District Government
Steven Kitindi	Mawambala Village
Andrew Kyei Agyare	Forestry Commission of Ghana
Noah Lameck	Njombe Regional Secretariat
Thomas Launer	The Forests Dialogue
Justin Lyakaunda	Mtanga Farm
Sara Lynch	WWF US
Evidence Machenje	Regional Administrative Office-Iringa
Faustin Maganga	Institute of Resource Assessment
Pastor Magingi	African Wildlife Foundation
Phillipo Malley	Mweka Wildlife College
Paulo Mandela	Sokoine University of Agriculture
Goliano Maro	
Alloyce Massaga	Ministry of Land, Housing and Human Settlement Development
Winfrida Matutu	Tanzania Association of Women Leaders in Agriculture and Environment
Joan Mayer	USAID-RS Iringa
Samuel Mdachi	Local Government
Johan Meijer	PBL Netherlands

Njuma Mgani
Ferdinand Mgaya
Luca Mgaya
Ethan Miller
Happiness Minja
Helena Mkoba

Malaki Msigwa
Ronald Mtana
Rodgers Muyambi
Gerald Mwakipesile
Said Mwinshehe
John Nakei
Mary Ndaru
Navaya Ndaskoi
Deo Nelmuguna
Michael Nkonu
Agrey Nyakunga
George Nyamninda
Tinara Nyato
Isaack Nyenza
Conjeta Nyumza
Robert Obiri-Yeboah
Silas Qambawayda
Fansisco Rodriguez
Vaileth Sagna
Charlse Sarpong Duah
Godfrey Seleman
Mwajuma Sizya
Dalma Somogoyi
Tressan Sullivan
Mauricio Talebi
Paulo Tarimo

Lynettte Tshabangu
Jeswald Ubisimbali
Geoffrey Wanyama
Saston William
MacDana Yunus
Mwachulla Zubery

Kiheso Mgago Village
SAGCOT Centre Limited
Sustainable Economic and Environmental Conservation (CSO)
Yale University/The Forests Dialogue
WWF TZ
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries-
Dept. of Land Use and Planning-SAGCOT region
Tanzania Land Tenure Assistance (LTA)
SAGCOT Centre Limited
WWF Uganda
National Land Use Planning Commission
OR Tamisemi
SAGCOT Centre Limited
Care International
Pastoralists Indigenous Non-Governmental Organization (PINGO's Forum)
DED Kilolo
IUCN Tanzania Country Office
Mtanga Foods
Tanzania Agricultural Development Bank (TADB)
DAICO Mufindi DC
Kilolo District Government
Mkonge Tea Farm
CODESULT Network
Passion for Transformation Tanzania
CMPC
Kiheso Mgagao Village
Forestry Commission of Ghana
SNV
Incomet
World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)
Tanzania Land Tenure Assistance
Forum Sao Paulo
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries-
Dept. of Land Use and Planning
WWF Zimbabwe
Mufindi DC
Kenyan Family Forest Association
Ministry of Lands
Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources
Tanzania Grass Roots Oriented Development (TARGODE)

Annex C – Full Description of Field Visits

The field visits took place in the districts of Kilolo and Mufindi in the SAGCOT region, as highlighted below:

1 Kilolo District

➔ Field Visit #1: Mtanga Farm

The farm was acquired in 2008 by Mtanga and averages 1500 ha in size. The farm was formerly owned by Tanzania Breweries Limited (TBL) and was abandoned for more than ten years after TBL sold it to a private company, which had no interest in barley production. Currently the farm is used for crop and animal production. The crops grown include potato seeds and pasture for making animal fodder. There are 41 ha of potato seeds, 34 ha of Rhodes grass, 45.9 ha of sorghum and 510 ha of planted trees (pines, eucalyptus and black wattle). In addition to the crops grown, there are 500 beef cattle and 700 sheep kept and grazed on the farm. The farm employs a total of 30 permanent staff and up to 200 seasonal casual laborers.

➔ Field Visit #2: Kihesa Mgagao Village

Kihesa Mgagao village is located about 5 km from Mtanga Farm. The village developed a village land use plan through participatory process. The Kilolo Land officer identified it as a well-functioning land use plan.

Leaders from the district office gave education on land use planning and land rights. Before this they had no prior knowledge about land use planning or even land rights. The education highlighted the benefits of setting aside land for different uses including livestock, pasture, and residential. Their perceived benefits include separate routes for cattle and for infrastructure, public space for social infrastructure such as schools and hospitals, and reduced conflicts between the pastoralists and the farmers.

Within the Village Land Use Committees there is a committee on natural resource management (NRM) and they follow up on any issues related to NRM.

➔ Field Visit #3: Mawambala Village

The village is located about 15 km from Kihesa Mgagao village. Some Mawambala community members objected to the idea of the VLUP leading to unsuccessful implementation. According to the villagers, the process was not fully participatory as only a select committee on land use attended a training which took place outside of the village. The main challenge to the process was a resulting conflict between farmers and pastoralists as some plots originally belonged to either group and had been allocated for different uses.

In addition to the conflicts arising between the pastoralists and farmers, the regulation implementing a 60-meter buffer zone around all water sources also became a contentious issue given most of the villagers depend on wetland cultivation as their main source of income.

2 Mufundi District

➔ Field Visit #4: Mkonge Tea Block

The block was established in 1969 and tea farming began in 1971 under the Tanzania Tea Authority (TAA). There were about 174 farmers of which 102 were men and 72 were female. The cooperative began in 1982 with the aim of bringing farmers together and fighting for their rights. The cooperative was registered in 2004. The current board consists of nine members—four males and five females. The farm has 344 ha under cultivation and supports more than 600 farmers currently. All the blocks have been surveyed for acquisition of CCROs, yet some farmers are yet to receive the certificate. The out-grower scheme is advanced and it has three trucks which transports farmers' tea to the factories; Unilever and Mufindi Tea Company (MTC).

The farm is certified by the Rainforest Alliance (RA), which promotes sustainable agriculture and forest management. The certification enables their tea leaves to be accepted in external markets as sustainable. The community is surrounded by two natural forests, one managed by the community while the other by the government. In order to protect the natural forest, the community formed an environmental committee consisting of 12 members to oversee the management of the forest. The committee also deals with environmental conservation and sustainable agriculture. The committee has set up bylaws in order to prevent fire outbreaks and protect water catchment areas.