Participatory mapping of shared resources is the first step in the joint village land use planning approach. (Fiona Flintan)

Joint village land use planning (Tanzania, United Republic of)

**DESCRIPTION**
Joint village land use planning is a process facilitated by Tanzania's land policy and legislation. It supports the planning, protection and management of shared resources across village boundaries. It is an important tool towards land use planning and better rangeland management. This case study provides an example from a cluster of villages in Kiteto District, Tanzania.

The Sustainable Rangeland Management Project (SRMP) is an initiative led by Tanzania's Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries (MoLF), the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) and the National Land Use Planning Commission (NLUPC), with support from International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Irish Aid and the International Land Coalition (ILC). A key innovation of the project has been the development of joint village land use planning (JVLUP). The JVLUP process in Kiteto District, Manyara Region began in November 2013, and included the villages of Lerug, Ngapapa, and Orkitikiti. The three villages share boundaries and grazing resources, and in order to illustrate a single shared identity across the boundaries, the name OLENGAPA was chosen - incorporating part of each village's name.

The total area of the three villages is (approx.) 59,000 hectares. The majority of inhabitants are Maasai pastoralists with some Ndorobo hunter-gatherers, and some farmers - most of whom are seasonal migrants. Mobility is central to the survival of the pastoralists and takes place across the three villages, as well as to locations in Kilindi, Gairo, and Bagamoyo Districts.

Average annual rainfall is between 800-1,000 mm per annum. There are no perennial rivers flowing through the OLENGAPA villages. The only permanent surface water source is Orkitikiti Dam, constructed in 1954.

In order to understand the different resources such as grazing areas, water points, cropping areas, livestock routes, and cultural places, SRMP supported participatory mapping. This assisted in developing a base map for the village land use planning process: it showed which resources were shared by the villages and where they were situated.

SRMP then helped village members to agree the individual village land use maps and plans - which zoned the village land into priority land uses - as well as the joint village land use map and plan, and the joint village land use agreement (JVLUA). These specified the grazing areas, water points, livestock routes and other shared resources. Reaching agreement was a protracted negotiation process between the villages, and within villages also - between different interest groups. It involved numerous community meetings and considerable investment of resources. Finally, each Village Assembly approved the JVLUA, which allocated approx. 20,700 ha of land for shared grazing – around 40% of the total village area. By-laws for management of the resources were developed and adopted.

Following approval of the JVLUA, the three OLENGAPA Village Councils established a Joint Grazing Land Committee made up of members from all three villages. This Committee is responsible for planning, management, enforcement of by-laws applicable to the OLENGAPA, and coordination of the implementation of both the OLENGAPA land use agreements and joint land use plan. In addition, a Livestock Keepers Association was established, including 53 founding members – but with most households from the three villages being associate members. A constitution was developed for the Association.
which was officially registered on 11 September 2015.
In January 2016 the Ministry of Lands approved and registered the village land boundary maps and deed plans for the three villages. The District Council has issued the village land certificates, and the next step is for Village Councils to begin issuing Certificates of Customary Rights of Occupancy (CCROs). The shared grazing area will require three group CCROs to be issued to the Livestock Keepers Association – one from each village - for the part of the grazing area that falls under its jurisdiction. Signboards and beacons marking the shared grazing area are being put in place.
In November 2017 a fourth village joined OLENGAPA, expanding the shared grazing area to 30,000 ha. The villages are now working to develop a management plan to improve rangeland productivity.

Main aims / objectives of the approach
To secure shared grazing areas and other rangeland resources for livestock keepers, and to improve their management.

Conditions enabling the implementation of the Technology/ ies applied under the Approach

- **Social/ cultural/ religious norms and values**: History of collective tenure, management and sharing of rangeland resources as part of sustainable rangeland management practices.
- **Institutional setting**: Strong local government/community institutions for leading process at local albeit their capacity may require building.
- **Legal framework (land tenure, land and water use rights)**: Tanzania’s legislation, if implemented well, provides an enabling environment for securing of community/village rights for both individuals and groups.
- **Policies**: Tanzania possesses facilitating national land use policy for the joint village land use planning approach, together with guidelines.
- **Land governance (decision-making, implementation and enforcement)**: Decision-making has been decentralised to the lowest levels, giving local communities considerable power to decide on the uses of their village land.
- **Knowledge about SLM, access to technical support**: Good local knowledge of rangeland management based on historical practice. Communities understand need for better rangeland management.
- **Workload, availability of manpower**: Well-structured local community bodies ready to provide manpower. Local government experts in place to support VLUP process.

Conditions hindering the implementation of the Technology/ ies applied under the Approach

- **Social/ cultural/ religious norms and values**: Marginalisation of pastoralists from decision-making processes at local and higher levels.
- **Availability/ access to financial resources and services**: Village land use planning process is costly due to the requirement to include government experts in the process in order to gather required data and to authorise plans. Lack of government priority to village land use planning, so poor allocation of government funds to the process.
- **Collaboration/ coordination of actors**: Poor coordination of different actors supporting VLUP in the past due to previous weakness of National Land Use Planning Commission (NLUPC). However, this is now changing as NLUPC becomes stronger and takes up coordination role.
- **Legal framework (land tenure, land and water use rights)**: Legislation allows village land to be transferred into public land if in the "public" or "national" interest - this facility confers insecurity on village land.
- **Policies**: There are conflicting policies over land coming from different sectors including land generally, together with forests, wildlife and livestock. These cause confusion at the local level. Depending on power of actors one set of policies may be stronger than another - wildlife-related policy for example can have a lot of power because there are many strong and influential tourism and conservation bodies lobbying for stronger protection of land, with potentially negative impacts for communities who want to use that land for other purposes.
- **Land governance (decision-making, implementation and enforcement)**: The process of village land use planning is costly due to the requirement for having local government experts involved, and the need to follow often complex procedures and steps. Many communities and even local government do not have adequate technical skills and knowledge to complete the long process, as well as not having adequate funds. This has held up the VLUP applications. Further few VLUPs move from their production stage to
Implementation stage including enforcement of bylaws and, for example, land management.

- **Knowledge about SLM, access to technical support**: Lack of investment in rangeland management and the provision of technical support e.g. through government extension services. Lack of technical knowledge in rangeland rehabilitation and improving rangeland productivity at scale.
- **Markets (to purchase inputs, sell products) and prices**: Lack of local markets and coordinated operations for livestock production.
- **Workload, availability of manpower**: Lack of knowledge, skills and capacity amongst local communities and government experts to complete JVLUP adequately, including such as resolving conflicts between different land users.

### PARTICIPATION AND ROLES OF STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What stakeholders / implementing bodies were involved in the Approach?</th>
<th>Specify stakeholders</th>
<th>Describe roles of stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>local land users/ local communities</td>
<td>Village members (Assembly) of three villages - Orikitiki, Lerug and Ngapapa.</td>
<td>All village members as the Village Assembly have an opportunity to contribute to the land use planning process and to approve it. Village government coordinated the planning process at local level. VLUMC develops plan. Village Council approves plans and issues CCROs. Rangeland Management Committee oversees development in rangelands. Livestock Keepers Association established made-up of all members of the villages that have livestock (nearly all village members) - they will be issued with CCROs as &quot;owners&quot; of the grazing land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community-based organizations</td>
<td>Village Council, Village Land Use Management Committee (VLUMC), Rangeland Management Committee, Livestock Keepers Association.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLM specialists/ agricultural advisers</td>
<td>Land use planning consultants</td>
<td>Provision of advice to the project team, local government and villagers on the JVLUP approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>researchers</td>
<td>International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)</td>
<td>Identification of good practice in village land use planning in Tanzania and ways to adapt and incorporate good practice into joint village land use planning to improve the approach. Research on role of and impact on pastoral women. Undertaking of baseline studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>KINNAPA Development Association (supported originally by CARE and Tanzania Natural Resource Forum).</td>
<td>KINNAPA is the local CSO partner working as part of the project to implement the JVLUP with local communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local government</td>
<td>District Council including the PLUM (participatory land use management planning experts)</td>
<td>The District Council provides local government oversight of the planning process and approves the plan before submitting to national government body. The PLUM technically supports the development of the JVLUP working with the village government(s) and village committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national government (planners, decision-makers)</td>
<td>Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries, National Land Use Planning Commission (NLUPC), Ministry of Lands, Housing and Human Settlements Development,</td>
<td>Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries leading the planning process with a sectoral interest in protecting rangelands. NLUPC provides technical oversight and guidance. Ministry of Lands is the national body that approves the final plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international organization</td>
<td>International Land Coalition (ILC)</td>
<td>ILC is the grant recipient for the funds from the donors. The project is implemented through ILC members such as ILRI. ILC coordinates its members work in Tanzania on land issues including the JVLUP through a national engagement strategy (NES). ILC also provides technical support to the process through its global/Africa programme - the ILC Rangelands Initiative. The ILC Rangelands Initiative is a platform for learning, sharing, influencing, and connecting on rangeland issues with the objective of making rangelands more secure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>IFAD and Irish Aid</td>
<td>Provide funds for the project. IFAD also provides technical support on land tenure issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lead agency**
The lead agency is the International Land Coalition (ILC) working through its members including ILRI. In country, the main implementer is the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries.
Involvement of local land users/local communities in the different phases of the Approach

### Involvement of local land users/local communities in the different phases of the Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Level of involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation/motivation</td>
<td>✓ interactively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>✓ actively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>✓ actively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/evaluation</td>
<td>✓ actively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>✓ actively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project supported communities to initiate the first steps taken to reach agreement on the need for planning and how this would be done.

Communities were centrally involved in the planning of the VLUP process, with support from local NGO and government.

Village government and community in general is responsible for the implementation of the planning process, with the support of local government.

The community is responsible for monitoring and evaluation, but lack skills and capacity in this regard requiring external support.

Research on information required for planning processes collected and generated by communities with the assistance of technical support from local NGO, local government and researchers.

---

**Flow chart**

Steps in the Joint Village Land Use Planning Process

---

**Decision-making on the selection of SLM Technology**

- Decisions were taken by:
  - land users alone (self-initiative)
  - mainly land users, supported by SLM specialists
  - all relevant actors, as part of a participatory approach
  - mainly SLM specialists, following consultation with land users
  - SLM specialists alone
  - politicians/leaders

- Decisions were made on:
  - evaluation of well-documented SLM knowledge (evidence-based decision-making)
  - research findings
  - personal experience and opinions (undocumented)

---

**TECHNICAL SUPPORT, CAPACITY BUILDING, AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT**

The following activities or services have been part of the approach:

- ✓ Capacity building/training
  - Advisory service
  - Institution strengthening (organizational development)
  - Monitoring and evaluation
  - Research

**Capacity building/training**

- Training was provided to the following stakeholders:
  - ✓ land users
  - ✓ field staff/advisers
  - ✓ government staff

- Form of training:
  - ✓ on-the-job
  - ✓ farmer-to-farmer
  - demonstration areas
  - public meetings
  - courses

- Subjects covered:
  - Land users were trained in land related and other relevant laws and the JVLUP process. Field staff/advisers were trained in land laws, the JVLUP process, gender, and conflict resolution. Local government were trained in the JVLUP process, gender and conflict resolution.

---

**Institution strengthening**
Institutions have been strengthened / established at the following level

- no
- yes, a little
- yes, moderately
- yes, greatly

Type of support

- financial
- capacity building/ training
- equipment
- data collected and database set up

Further details

Local government bodies including Village Council, VLUMC (village land use management committee) and Livestock Keepers Association have all had capacity strengthened, but more is required (particularly for the latter). Capacity of the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries and the National Land Use Planning Commission to implement JVLUP has been built.

Monitoring and evaluation

M&E has not been strong in previous phases, but now is central with baselines being carried out in all new clusters of villages where the project will work so that impact can be fully assessed.

Research

Research was carried out to identify good practice (in terms of social, economic and environmental impacts) from which the JVLUP process was developed. In future phases the full impacts of this JVLUP in terms of social, economic and ecological impact are being researched.

FINANCING AND EXTERNAL MATERIAL SUPPORT

Annual budget in USD for the SLM component

- < 2,000
- 2,000-10,000
- 10,000-100,000
- 100,000-1,000,000
- > 1,000,000

Precise annual budget: n.a.

The following services or incentives have been provided to land users

- Financial/ material support provided to land users
- Subsidies for specific inputs
- Credit
- Other incentives or instruments

Other incentives or instruments

Tanzanian policy and legislation states that all village should have a VLUP, therefore this was an incentive for stakeholders to invest in the process. In addition conflicts over land use are increasingly a problem in Tanzania - so the resolution of these was also an important incentive.

IMPACT ANALYSIS AND CONCLUDING STATEMENTS

Impacts of the Approach

Did the Approach empower local land users, improve stakeholder participation?
Local village communities now feel strongly empowered in protecting and managing their land. The process has brought different stakeholders together and strengthened commitment to make the process work.

Did the Approach enable evidence-based decision-making?
The piloting of the JVLUP showed what is possible and the positive impacts realised (albeit they could have been better documented). On these results the process is being scaled-up.

Did the Approach help land users to implement and maintain SLM Technologies?
The planning process has laid the foundations for improved rangeland management - what is now required is investment in that management.

Did the Approach improve coordination and cost-effective implementation of SLM?

Did the Approach mobilize/ improve access to financial resources for SLM implementation?

Did the Approach improve knowledge and capacities of land users to implement SLM?

- Land users have greater knowledge of the potential and need for rangeland management based on a better understanding of their land and resources gained through the JVLUP process, but they still need skills and resources to put this knowledge into action.

Did the Approach improve knowledge and capacities of other stakeholders?

National and local government have seen the potential of the JVLUP to resolve conflicts over land use, and their capacities to implement the JVLUP in this regard has been improved.

Did the Approach build/ strengthen institutions, collaboration between stakeholders?
The approach is helping build relations between the Ministry Livestock and Fisheries and the NLUPC together with NGO(s) at national level, as well as between different stakeholders involved in JVLUP at local levels.

Did the Approach mitigate conflicts?

Through the process of JVLUP the roots of land use conflicts come to the surface and must be resolved before agreement is reached. This may cause tensions and even conflict along the way - but the outcome should be positive.
Did the Approach empower socially and economically disadvantaged groups?
Pastoralists are often left out of village land use planning processes. This approach when implemented well gives greater opportunity for them to be involved. However this is still a challenge.

Did the Approach improve gender equality and empower women and girls?
Women can be left out of village land use planning processes. This approach when implemented well gives greater opportunity for them to be involved. However this is still a challenge.

Did the Approach encourage young people/ the next generation of land users to engage in SLM?
Youth can be left out of village land use planning processes. This approach when implemented well gives greater opportunity for them to be involved. However this is still a challenge.

Did the Approach improve issues of land tenure/ user rights that hindered implementation of SLM Technologies?
By following the JVLUP process village land has been certified and secured, as well as the rights of access and use of livestock keepers to the grazing land.

Did the Approach lead to improved food security/ improved nutrition?
This has not been specifically monitored but it assumed by having stronger security to land and resources, food security and nutrition will be improved.

Did the Approach improve access to markets?
This has not been specifically monitored but it assumed by having stronger security to land and resources, access to markets will be improved.

Did the Approach lead to improved access to water and sanitation?
In terms of water for livestock the JVLUP process has secured rights for the three villages to shared water resources.

Did the Approach lead to more sustainable use/ sources of energy?

Did the Approach lead to improved access to water and sanitation?

Did the Approach improve access to markets?

Did the Approach improve the capacity of the land users to adapt to climate changes/ extremes and mitigate climate related disasters?
By having stronger security to land and resources local land users are better placed to adapt to climate change etc.

Did the Approach lead to employment, income opportunities?
This has not been specifically monitored but it assumed by having stronger security to land and resources, income opportunities will be improved.

Main motivation of land users to implement SLM
✓ increased production
✓ increased profit(ability), improved cost-benefit-ratio
✓ reduced land degradation
✓ reduced risk of disasters
✓ reduced workload
✓ payments/ subsidies
✓ rules and regulations (fines)/ enforcement
✓ prestige, social pressure/ social cohesion
✓ affiliation to movement/ project/ group/ networks
✓ environmental consciousness
✓ customs and beliefs, morals
✓ enhanced SLM knowledge and skills
✓ aesthetic improvement
✓ conflict mitigation

CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNT

Strengths: land user’s view
♦ Improved the security of access and use to village land including grazing.
♦ Brought attention to the challenges faced by land users in the area in protecting and using their village land, and the need for more investment and support for this.
♦ Pastoralists are now more central to decision-making processes than they were before.

Strengths: compiler’s or other key resource person’s view
♦ Collaboration of different stakeholders in implementing the approach has supported a new way of working.
♦ Capacity of different stakeholders has been built along the way through joint problem-solving and learning-by-doing.
♦ The approach - with adaptation - has application in other contexts/countries and shows that even if a rangeland is split by administrative boundaries there is opportunity to work across those village boundaries in order to maintain the functionality of the rangeland and land use systems such as pastoralism that depend upon this.

Weaknesses/ disadvantages/ risks: land user’s view → how to overcome
♦ Despite village land being theoretically protected, in practice it can still be encroached upon. → Greater support provided from government to enforce protection of land.
♦ Time-consuming process which became more expensive than anticipated resulting in some gaps in funding. → Process needs to be refined through practice, and adequate funds allocated from beginning.

Weaknesses/ disadvantages/ risks: compiler’s or other key resource person’s view → how to overcome
♦ The selection of villages for JVLUP needs more care to ensure that enabling conditions for JVLUP exist. → In future selection of villages for JVLUP a set of criteria should be used that enable more enabling conditions to exist.
♦ Information has not been methodologically collected on social, environmental and economic impacts of the approach. → In future the impacts of the approach need to be fully monitored and evaluated.
♦ The VLUP is an expensive process to follow. → National government needs to identify ways to reduce the cost of the VLUP so that more villages can undertake it. Government needs to allocate more funds to VLUP. The VLUP is an expensive process to follow.
♦ Need for an enabling environment. → The policy and legislation in Tanzania enables this process - it is not the case in the majority of other African countries.

Sustainability of Approach activities
Can the land users sustain what has been implemented through the Approach (without external support)?
no
yes
✓ uncertain

In the majority of other African countries.

Need for an enabling environment.
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