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1. INTRODUCTION

The Bumbuna Hydroelectric Project (BHP) identified the Loma Mountains Non-hunting Forest Reserve as a suitable biodiversity off-set for important habitats that would be lost due to flooding once the Bumbuna Dam was operational. In order to off-set this loss of biodiversity the Loma Mountains were identified as being of equal or greater global biodiversity importance and a decision was taken to establish a national park, the Loma Mountains National Park (LMNP).

During this process it was also recognised that the creation of the national park could significantly impact upon the livelihoods and development aspirations of the neighbouring communities. In order to mitigate this, a socio-economic survey was carried out and a process-framework developed during the management planning for the future national park.

A key recommendation stemming from this was to develop a management plan for the national park and a Community Action Plan (CAP) for those communities impacted by the parks’ creation; the latter was to be developed by the Sierra Leone Biodiversity Conservation Project (BCP). There was little description given to the form the CAP should take, however, during the management planning process for LMNP it was widely recognised that it was necessary to develop the capacities of local communities to sustainably manage biodiversity from both a biodiversity conservation, and from a sustainable rural livelihoods, perspective. The reasoning behind this approach was two-fold. Firstly there is clearly a considerable livelihood dependence upon these resources, and secondly, given the topography, climate and soils in the community lands, there are limited opportunities for conventional or intensive agriculture, indeed it is necessary to reach a careful balance between intensification of agriculture and the risk of rapid land degradation.

The proposed Community Action Plan stems from the LMNP Management Plan. It recognises that there are few options available for both the local communities around LMNP and for the Forestry Division (FD) as the statutory agency tasked with conserving biodiversity and other ecosystem goods and services.

It provides a new concept for Sierra Leone to sustainably manage renewable natural resources on customary lands, under custodianship of Traditional Authorities (TA) by devolving management authority and responsibility to the lowest appropriate level, in accordance with the Conservation and Wildlife Policy of 2010. Furthermore, it gives an opportunity for the local community to take stock of what they have before they replace it with other land use opportunities that may be less resilient and only offer short-term advantages over what they already have, but are currently denied the ability to manage and benefit from.

The local rural communities’ needs are intimately linked with the sustainability and well-being of the natural resource base. Any premise that rural people have little interest in natural resource management and must therefore be offered external incentives to encourage them to participate in its management are largely unfounded. In fact their very future wellbeing depends upon their participation and the sound conservation management of these resources. Many rural people regard biodiversity and other natural values as an important part of their livelihood and its sustainable use is of real concern to them. What is at
stake is the nature of their participation. Passive participation will incur significant time costs, and alternative livelihoods might expose them to significant economic risks and enterprises founded upon the existing resource base of forest products are vulnerable because this remains largely unmanaged.

In order to maximise the effectiveness of management and the efficiency of local income-generating livelihoods it will be important to develop different approaches to management and to distribute management costs and benefits equitably amongst stakeholders to reward good management. In order to meet both the aspirations of local communities and achieve biodiversity (and other natural values and ecosystem services) conservation it must be assumed that the state will protect those resources or areas most vulnerable. The remainder, those areas off-reserve and belonging to the community, will need to be managed by those people closest to the resources. What is being described is the local communities playing a greater role in managing the natural resources in and, in return, benefiting to a greater extent from them at the same time diversifying their livelihood opportunities and reducing their risks. Where resources are not totally protected by the state; this might be described as community-based natural resource management (CBNRM).

In any event, and by whatever name we describe it, it should not be regarded as a "solution to solve all problems" in a rural development and biodiversity conservation context, faced by LMNP and the surrounding communities. “It is important that the economic gains from community-based resource management or alternatives such as eco-tourism are not overplayed. In certain circumstances the income generated by sustainable use of biodiversity can be extraordinary. But in most instances, utilisation of wild products (both consumptive and non-consumptive) offers no more than modest sustainable and secure incomes to local communities. That said; linking the economic benefit with the management of the resources has the effect of substantially empowering local communities, particularly women, and producing significant and lasting social capital”\(^1\).

2. PURPOSE OF THE CAP

There are two purposes of the CAP. Firstly, it is intended to guide the development of the management of biodiversity resources off-reserve, and secondarily, to provide the basis for co-management of certain biodiversity resources and other natural values within the national park and to secure these resources both within and outside the NP for the benefit of all:

- From biodiversity conservation perspective the primary aim is to protect these resources from over-exploitation.
- From a rural livelihoods perspective the primary aim is to secure a sustainable supply of these forest goods and services for the benefit of local communities.

Therefore the CAP is a dual purpose action plan and there is no priority (between these two perspectives) because the local rural communities’ needs are very closely linked with the sustainability and well-being of the natural resource (or biodiversity) base, and vice versa. As was stated in the introduction; what is at stake is the nature of their participation; passive participation is unlikely to

\(^1\) Prof. Marshall Murphree
create the security of tenure necessary for investment, therefore, local communities must be enabled to take an active role in resource management. The CAP, through a CBNRM approach, offers:

- A new option and approach to tackle developmental problems and issues by focussing attention on natural resource use and land management.
- An improvement of local livelihoods and introducing natural resource products into the formal market place the revenue to local authorities will improve.
- Support to democratisation and strengthening local governance structures.

The LMNP management plan in combination with the CAP provide for a framework that strengthens village/section level traditional institutions to give them the authority and the responsibility to manage renewable natural resources found on their village territories. Furthermore, it clearly defines a unit of management with which the Forestry Division can enter into agreements on conditional user rights within the protected area (e.g. for NTFPs).

![Schematic representation of a twofold governance structure for the management of LMNP as well as adjacent village territories](image)

In the national park, Forestry Division, both has the authority and the responsibility to manage the area. It is foreseen that a Conservation Site Management Committee (CSMC) is established which is representative of the main stakeholder groups (e.g. Forestry Division, District Council, Traditional Authority, etc.) concerning the management of LMNP.
When it comes to the management of off-reserve natural resources the CSMC does not reflect the scale at which day-to-day management decisions are taking place. This is better reflected and more representative if it is placed at the Township Chieftaincy-level, in particular with the Village Council as schematically shown in the figure below.

The green circle represents the CSMC which is governing the national park. The purple circle represents the village territories in two chiefdoms. Each chiefdom (headed by a Paramount Chief) is subdivided into Section (headed by a Section Chief), which is indicated by the blue, green and orange circles. A number of villages (headed by a Village or Township Chief) fall under a Section. At the village level, the Village Chief is represented by a Council which essentially represents the family heads of the households within a village. This Village Council with its Chief is essentially representative of the “land user” who takes his or her day-to-day decisions on how to use any natural resource found in his or her vicinity.

### 3. COMMUNITY-BASED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

The approach advocated by the CAP is far from theoretical. Rather it is grounded in a careful analysis of the driving forces behind the loss of environmental goods and service, the likely response strategies of local communities, individual farmers, hunters and gatherers, as well as the principles and experience that have been learned from similar situations in other countries. The most relevant are listed below. However, it is worth reiterating that this approach is not a cure-all for natural resource management, it is merely a means to addressing resource use challenges in complex rural socio-ecosystems (outside of the strictly protected areas) and provide an enabling environment that supports the sustainable management of biodiversity as a common property. Therefore CBNRM should be seen as little more than the application of the following five principles:

1. **Effective management of wildlife is best achieved by giving it focussed value for those who live with it.** People seek to manage the environment when the benefits of management exceed the costs. Simply put if the income or benefit from managing/conserving natural resources exceeds the opportunity costs of reduced harvesting, better harvesting techniques, reduced farming, etc.; then people will tolerate and conserve those resources. If the benefits are a substantial proportion of income then people will incorporate their management into their conventional agriculture and land use.

2. **Differential inputs must result in differential benefits.** This principle relates to the question “value for whom?” The answer is – those who have the resources and pay for its existence. At a national level, the FD is recognised as the custodians of protected areas and the resources they contain as well as biodiversity resources outside of the protected areas system. However, it is equally important to recognise that these people who we might term “local people” or “local community” are the *de facto* custodians of many, or most, of these

---

resources off-reserve, bear the cost of their continued existence, and might be considered the principle beneficiary from their management in order to achieve sustainability within the system.

3. There must be a positive correlation between quality of management and the magnitude of benefit. The differential input requiring differential benefit involves not only the assets and costs mentioned above, it also incorporates management costs, both quantitative and qualitative. A fundamental policy objective is to provide the motivation for good management; thus, policy should ensure that good management pays. Failure to encourage and reward good management will result in “mining” of the resource for short-term gain.

4. The unit of proprietorship should be the unit of production, management and benefit. This means that the unit of decision-making must also be the same as the unit that manages and benefits. This component is fundamental to any sustainable resource management regime. However, it is recognised that due to issues of scale and the mobile nature and temporal and spatial boundaries of wildlife resources, mechanisms that allow for collective management decisions need to be used. These mechanisms generally exist within the community and need to be identified.

5. The unit for collective management should be as small as practicable and functionally efficient within ecological and socio-political constraints. From a social dynamics perspective scale is an important consideration; large-scale externally imposed structures tend to be ineffective, increasing the potential for corruption, evasion of responsibility and lethargy in respect of broad participation. Where collective management structures are based on existing collective management structures and are at a scale that ensures regular contact of the members, it becomes possible to enforce conformity to rules through peer pressure and control individual actions through collective sanction.

3.1. Property regimes

Underpinning the approach is an explicit understanding of the property regimes that are prevalent in the project area. A property regime or tenure is taken to mean the strength of ownership, proprietorship or rights of access to a resource. There are four systems of tenure that can be applied to biodiversity resources, namely:

- **Single owner state** – in which the rights are vested in the state, for instance in a strictly protected area or core zone of a protected area;
- **Single owner private** – in which the rights are vested in an individual or corporate body. Such arrangements relating to natural resource use and management are unusual in most countries where these resources are normally considered the property of the state;

---

Common property - in which clearly defined and agreed rights of access are established within a defined user group and with agreed rules of access and use, for instance for access to grazing or fisheries, and;
Open access – in which there are no constraints on access or recognition of individuals that are allowed to use the resource. As a result, resource use becomes opportunistic. Open access systems are inherently unstable while not necessarily unsustainable. Resources are effectively treated as res nullius (belonging to no one) and the lack of any agreed controls over resource use can rapidly lead to overexploitation and result in economic or biological extinction.

A fundamental policy objective of the CAP is to facilitate the transfer of authority and responsibility between agencies, institutions and individuals so that it more effectively and efficiently reflects the costs and benefits of wise management, provides greater security of resource tenure to those closest to the resource and dependent upon it for their livelihoods. In short it legitimises a common property management regime.

3.2. Community and state options

It can be rationally argued that at all levels – global, regional, national and local – society has three options regarding how biodiversity resources are managed. These are protection, utilisation or abandonment. Based upon the premise that a resource can be utilised and that utilisation can – under favourable conditions contribute to the sustainable management of a resource. Therefore, there are three management alternatives for natural resources:

Protection: Given that the particular circumstances of a resource – such as scarcity, level of threat, historic events etc. – result in a precarious situation where utilisation of the resource is considered too risky, protection – through legislation, protected area, etc. – is a valuable tool to ensure sustainability of the resource. However, this is a costly option and these costs – prohibition, enforcement, management, opportunity costs etc. – are both definable and measurable and, therefore, sustainability can be measured against the ability of society/national governments to meet these costs.

Utilisation: Given that a resource can withstand a level of utilisation that is biologically sustainable it is possible to establish a management regime, which maintains the resource at an acceptable level providing that those who incur the management or opportunity costs are able to benefit from its utilisation.

Abandonment: Given that a resource cannot be utilised sustainably and society is either unable or unwilling to incur the costs of protecting the resource, then the resource must be “abandoned”. That is; there is a high risk of extirpation or biological or economic extinction. While it is unlikely that any society would knowingly advocate abandoning a resource – species, population or ecosystem – when protective measures are applied without the material resources or capacity to effectively carry this out, there is a high risk of abandonment by default. This situation can commonly be found throughout many protected areas and off-reserve

It should also be noted that it is possible to have private property regimes operating within this and private enterprises based upon a common property
where competition for scarce financial resources across all policy sectors—health, education, infrastructure, defence, etc.—results in under-funding and a gradual degradation of the resource and species loss as a result of uncontrolled illegal activity.

3.3. Costs and benefits

The greatest opportunity for sustainable management occurs when the primary beneficiaries are those people who are closest to the resource, using the resources and incurring management and/or opportunity costs. Simply put—people will manage a resource if the benefits from managing it are greater than the costs incurred. A frequently encountered situation is one where the benefits of protection (wilderness, tourism and recreation, spiritual values, etc.) are realised by the wider society, but the local people have to bear the costs of protection. Therefore this is a critical component underpinning the CAP should be an understanding that benefits reflect the costs of management and be should shared with local people where there is a reasonable and equitable case to be made.

3.4. Authority and responsibility for forest resources

Authority and responsibility are conceptually linked. That is—authority without responsibility becomes meaningless or obstructive. Conversely, responsibility without authority lacks the necessary instrumental and motivational components for its efficient exercise. The significance of this becomes apparent if the term authority is replaced with control or regulation and responsibility by management or use within communal lands immediately surrounding LMNP. In many instances of protected areas the state may be the de jure authority for biodiversity, however due to insufficient material and human resources the de facto managers may be the local people or communities responsible for day-to-day land management and whose actions will have the most significant impact upon biodiversity.

3.5. Tenure and pricing

Property or tenure strongly influences how a wild resource, such as biodiversity, is managed and should be an important component of any planning considerations. A property or tenure regime is taken to mean the strength of ownership, proprietorship or rights of access to a resource.

Recognising that the strength of tenure of a resource plays a significant role in the way in which it will be managed, a fundamental objective of the CAP should be to ensure that rights of access to a resource are clearly defined and broadly accepted, with transparent and democratic mechanisms available to resolve conflicts and enforce these rights.

In order to be sustainable, security of tenure need not necessarily be absolute. However, the greater the perception of security and the fewer restrictions imposed upon the users, the greater the opportunities for sustainable management. An important measure of security of tenure can be the decision not to use a resource.
It should be clearly stated that it is possible to maintain these resources under state ownership while allowing conditional and proprietary rights to local communities. In effect the resources can be held in trust by the communities for an agreed set of objectives (e.g. sustainable management and income generation). It is the strength of the relationship and arrangements between the state and the local communities that will determine the quality of this management and the perception of local “ownership” which will motivate their investment in sustainable management.

4. WHAT IS THE CAP?

The approach taken by the CAP will provide a number of positive developments mostly with regard to the enabling environment at the community level and related to the way that forest natural resources can be sustainably managed and utilised for the social and economic benefit of those communities surrounding LMNP. Therefore the approach taken by the CAP, at the community level, is:

- About creating the opportunity and the freedom to choose. It is about giving the farmers an opportunity to incorporate natural resource management into his/her livelihood strategy.
- It is not about development projects or conservation projects per se, but it is about developing a framework in which these things can happen.
- It is not about law enforcement but it empowers people to protect their resources.
- It does not encourage the expansion of protected areas but rather creates a framework for protected areas and people working together for each other’s benefit.
- It does not promise money but it provides a way for people to improve their livelihoods and income.
- It does not solve development problems but it can help people find the answers to some.

At the District level the interest are primarily about costs, income and politics. It:

- Offers a new option and approach to tackle developmental problems and issues by focussing attention on natural resource use and land management.
- By improving local livelihoods and introducing natural resource products into the formal market place the revenue to local authorities can improve.
- The process supports democratisation and strengthens local governance structures.

At a National level it can be seen to be stimulating rural development, enhancing bio-diversity conservation and reducing state costs. In this respect:

- It is not the solution to human wildlife/protected area conflicts. But it is an important part of a range of measures that together can form Sierra Leone’s conservation strategy.
- It can reduce pressure on protected areas and provide additional security for the protected areas and the integrity of its boundaries.
- It can reduce the costs of law enforcement outside and inside the protected area.
- It can provide a foundation upon which other development and conservation strategies, projects and approaches can be built.
It is not a quick, nor easy, solution, neither is it a model to be imposed upon the local District and communities, rather it provides a robust approach to understanding complex ecological and social relationships in rural areas.

4.1. How the CAP will work

The CAP will follow a process leading to the transfer of rights and responsibilities from the state to a level that can be broadly described as “the community” but in reality it represents a unit of natural resource management that closely fits the existing mechanisms and institutions for collective decision-making and conflict resolution. In this instance it is likely to be the Township Chiefdom and will in all likelihood incorporate the Section Chiefs for reasons of scale in managing the resources and harmonising the arrangements between neighbouring Townships.

4.2. The CAP and the LMNP Management Plan

The CAP is drawn from the Vision:

“LMNP is effectively managed with the full participation of local stakeholders securing all the biological resources and providing environmental goods and service for the benefit of local communities and wider society. Local communities have agreed rights of access to certain areas and resources and worship sites. The lands surrounding LMNP are sustainably managed by the local communities supplying them with a rich source of farmland, bushmeat and other resources and ecosystem services for their self-sufficiency and economic development. Non-timber forest products, including bushmeat, are making a significant contribution to local social and economic development”

And the objectives of the LMNP Management Plan. The MP has three objectives relevant to the CAP. These are:

Objective 2: Conservation of biological diversity by sustainable use of species, habitats and ecosystems goods and services.
Objective 3: Sustainable economic and social development of the Loma Mountains National Park local communities through the sustainable utilisation of the natural and cultural resource base.
Objective 4: An enabling environment supportive of biological diversity conservation through protection, sustainable utilisation, and the social and economic development of Loma Mountains communities, creating a functionally efficient policy, legal and institutional framework and a broad public awareness and support for the national park’s Vision
5. IMPLEMENTING THE CAP

5.1. Getting started
The CAP will initially be project driven in as much as components will be supported by the BCP particularly with regards to facilitation. However, the FD, DC and TA will be expected to play a significant role in the process.

5.2. Step 1: Sensitisation
This process has already begun with the participatory approach followed during the management planning exercise. However, this will need to be stepped up and extended to all 30 Township Chiefdoms, 3 Section Heads and the 2 Paramount Chieftaincies. At the District Council there will be a need to “sell” the approach to an institution that is very much focused on conventional development approaches and will therefore need to become familiar with the process and objectives. The FD will also need to be sensitized to the idea of devolving some of its powers to non-state actors. An important part of this will be helping the agency to understand that it is not abrogating its responsibilities but rather it is ensuring that the management of these resources is effectively taking place at an appropriate level.

5.3. Step 2: Determining the scale at which management takes place
Scale is important in the decision-making process as well as in resolving conflicts between individuals and collectives. To some extent this process has already begun during the management planning exercise which sought to determine the appropriate levels for transferring management authority and responsibility to a level that more effectively reflects the costs and benefits of wise management. However, it will need to continue until it is clear which decisions can be made at which level within the system (e.g. FD, DC, TA, SC, TC [Council of Elders] or individual farmers])

5.4. Step 3: Determining the unit of management
The term community is ill-defined for the purposes of forest resource management lacking any clear definition. Importantly, it lacks the numerical, spatial and legal context that would define a system of management. In practice it is necessary to determine a unit of management to which the authority and responsibility can be transferred (or devolved), which can make collective decisions about the time, means and type of use of these resources, it has a membership that can not only have the rights to use the resource but critically it can identify who cannot use the resources, possess an executive that can take decisions on behalf of the membership and be held accountable by outside agencies, and lastly, it must be easily defined in law as a body corporate. The initial investigations carried out during the preliminary planning phase suggest that the Township Chiefdom might provide be suitable structure for collective management because it is small but still practicable and functionally efficient within ecological and socio-political constraints. “From a social dynamics perspective scale is an important consideration; large-scale externally imposed
structures tend to be ineffective, increasing the potential for corruption, evasion of responsibility and lethargy in respect of broad participation. Where collective management structures are based on existing collective management structures and are at a scale that ensures regular contact of the members, it becomes possible to enforce conformity to rules through peer pressure and control individual actions through collective sanction.”

5.5. Step 4: Developing the internal organisation and the enabling environment

While the DC, TA, SH and TC all have a functioning internal organisational structure this has rarely been applied to common resource management except where it relates to land for farming. There appear to be some examples of how people have made arrangements to manage and benefit from a common property (for instance in the management of natural fisheries in the area) but this has not been formalised. Therefore it is important at this early stage that there is external assistance in organising and developing the internal governance. In some respects this will take the form of due diligence by external agencies to determine that the costs and benefits are equitably distributed throughout the membership but there is also an organisational aspect that will need to be developed. It is likely that this can be largely delivered by conventional capacity building delivered by non-governmental organisations currently working with local communities.

In order to be recognised by the state as the appropriate authority for the management of forest resources the existing internal arrangements need to be formalised. This can be achieved by developing a Constitution and internal Rules and Regulations which can be recognised by District Council bye-laws.

5.6. Step 5: Delineating the boundaries

While the TA boundaries are already reasonably well defined and accepted it becomes necessary to accurately fix these and map them. Furthermore, these need to be clearly accepted by neighbours if they are not to cause conflicts over resources in the future. This can be carried out using conventional GIS techniques and the participation of the TC membership.

5.7. Step 6: Empowering the community

Having demonstrated a willingness to invest in forest resource management by developing the internal governance (a process that can be considered as an investment by the local community) in order to develop the unit of resource management it is then necessary for the state, through the FD, to transfer sufficient powers to this level in order that they can effectively assume a management role. It is not immediately apparent what form this might take but in all likelihood it could be a provision in the new Wildlife Act and an area specific

5 Principles for developing a sustainable use system (adapted from Murphree, M. J., Wildlife Division Support Project, CREMA Review Report No. 56. Wildlife Division of the Forestry Commission, Ghana and IUCN. October 2005)
certificate devolving the rights to manage to the registered community or unit of management.

5.8. Step 7: Developing the capacity of the community to manage and benefit from forest resources

This takes three forms:

1. Timber resources: these represent a significant economic value and the sustainable harvesting of timber requires a certain level of technical expertise that is unlikely to be found immediately within the local community. However, it should be possible for the community to work with the FD to develop a harvesting schedule, according to their needs that can be enforced and monitored by the local community.

2. The capacity to sustainably manage wildlife (e.g. non-listed abundant species) and NTFP resources is unlikely to require specific technical assistance. It may be that the FD can provide some assistance in stock assessment (particularly with regards botanical NTFPs).

3. Once the resource base is secured it is possible to encourage and support small to medium enterprises based upon forest products on the understanding that the resource base is securely managed and that consumption will not outstrip production. This can be delivered by conventional non-governmental organisations and the DC to improve the level of small to medium enterprises and ensure that they are capable of negotiating with external markets.

5.9. Step 8: Monitoring, evaluation and adaptation

It is important that the effectiveness of the system is monitored against a range of indicators and to meet a variety of expectations. The expectations of local communities might differ from those of the FD in determining success but the objectives of management are broadly aligned. An important aspect of monitoring this process is to not overburden the community with indicators or targets and to remember that they will in all likelihood choose subjective indicators to measure performance. From a national institutional perspective a brief outline of the types of indicators that might be useful to monitor is given in Annex 2.
## 6. THE COMMUNITY ACTION PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action no.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Primary responsibility</th>
<th>Contributing partners</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Action 1: Sensitisation of Township Chiefdoms, Paramount Chiefdoms &amp; District Council</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
<td>To make villagers and local administrative institutions aware of the aims of the CAP off-reserve CBNRM programme and the process that will be followed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Brief description** | i. A series of village-level meetings will be carried out at the Section Head and Township level. The aims of the programme will be discussed, the limits of what can be achieved will be made clear to all in order to manage expectations and the process that will be followed will be mapped out, including a realistic time frame to develop the CBNRM system.  
ii. Meetings and a number of workshops will be carried out with the DC to raise awareness (of biodiversity management and sustainable utilisation) and develop a clear pathway, integrated into the District-level planning framework | | | | | | |
| 1.1 | Hold meetings with the 3 affected Section Heads. At least 2 rounds of meetings will be held. Township Chiefdom representation should be included in the second round | BCP | DC & TA | Year 1 | High | Minutes of meetings | Minutes of meetings | Villages are aware of the challenges to sustainable management of natural resources but are unaware of the possibilities of changing the system |
| 1.2 | Hold meetings in all 30 Township Chiefdoms that border upon LMNP | BCP | DC & TA | Year 1 | High | Minutes of meetings | Minutes of meetings | |
| 1.2.1 | Select 10 Township Chiefdoms and carry out follow-up visits | BCP | DC | Year 1 | High | Minutes of meetings | Minutes of meetings | |

---

6 Note that if Townships are agreeable to combine meetings this can be arranged to reduce the number of site visits but should only be carried out on the request of the Townships involved. Follow-up meetings can be combined if the Townships are in agreement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action no.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Primary responsibility</th>
<th>Contributing partners</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>Select 6 Township Chiefdoms and carry out follow-up visits (2 TCs per Section Head)</td>
<td>BCP</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Minutes of meetings, selection of Townships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>At least 3 workshops with the DC to introduce the concept, to decide on the most effective means to carry out the programme and to integrate the activities into the annual work plans</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>BCP</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Work plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC is unaware of the potential to build social capital and provide a secure basis for economic development based upon wildlife resources as a land use option</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action 2: Sensitisation of FD**

**Objective**
To ensure that the FD is fully aware of the process of establishing a CBNRM programme to support LMNP and can provide agency support to the process

**Brief description**

1. 3 workshops held with the FD to raise awareness of the implications of the CBNRM approach followed by the CAP and the roles and responsibilities of the FD in this process
2. Annual work planning including the LMNP CBNRM programme

| 2.1      | A minimum of 3 facilitated workshops                                    | FD                     | BCP                   | Year 1 | High     | Workshop reports                                                          | FD has no experience of CBNRM as an approach to biodiversity conservation and rural development |
| 2.1.1    | A facilitated workshop and follow up work to ensure that the new Wildlife Act supports CBNRM where appropriate | FD                     | BCP                   | Year 1 – 2 | Medium   | New Wildlife Act                                                          | The current legislation could arguably support this approach but there would be a number of inefficiencies and perverse incentives which would weaken the system and reduce the effectiveness |

7 In following years the annual work planning activities will be integrated into the ordinary DC planning process
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Action no.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Activity</strong></th>
<th><strong>Primary responsibility</strong></th>
<th><strong>Contributing partners</strong></th>
<th><strong>Timing</strong></th>
<th><strong>Priority</strong></th>
<th><strong>Indicator</strong></th>
<th><strong>Baseline</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Annual strategy workshops to review progress and adjust the CAP as necessary</td>
<td>FD</td>
<td>BCP&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Year 2-3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Work plans</td>
<td>There is currently no CBNRM in the annual work plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action 3: Develop the Township Chiefdom and/or Traditional Authority Section Head as an appropriate unit of natural resource management**

**Objective**
To develop a community-level structure capable of sustainably managing biodiversity resources and ensuring that the costs and benefits of wise management are equitably distributed

**Brief description**

i. Meetings & workshops (as needed<sup>9</sup>) to be held with the 6 Township Chiefdoms and Section Heads selected through Action 1. Identify the scale at which natural resource management should take place and to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the TA (PC, SH and TCs)

ii. Agree an appropriate name for the “unit of management”

iii. Develop the internal governance structures (e.g. the Council of Elders) suitable for collective decision-making and internal conflict resolution

iv. Identify the membership of the “community” or unit of management and ensure that there is adequate representation of the Membership by the Township-level Council of Elders

v. Identify the scale (e.g. individual members, Council of Elders/Township Chiefdom, Section Head, Paramount Chief) at which decisions can be made, and about which resources these should include

vi. Assess the resource base

---

<sup>8</sup> Year 2, FD to carry out in year 3 without BCP

<sup>9</sup> This is an iterative process and will require significant follow up meetings to allow the community to discuss issues and reach conclusions and make decisions

<sup>10</sup> Year 1 & 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action no.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Primary responsibility</th>
<th>Contributing partners</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>arrangements for assuming the authority and responsibility to manage the “community’s” natural resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>users are fully sensitised and prepared to take “control” of the process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>these resources but has no authority to control these activities and to exclude anyone from using them, therefore use of these resources is largely opportunistic and open access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>Identify the membership of the “community” or unit of management</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>BCP &amp; DC</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Clearly defined membership</td>
<td>Membership is very likely recognised already but this needs to “tested” to ensure that no one with a legitimate claim is disadvantaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Assess the resource base in the selected Township Chiefdoms(^\text{11})</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>BCP &amp; FD</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Schematic plan of natural resources and relative abundance within the Township Chiefdom</td>
<td>It is likely that the members of each Township are broadly aware of the natural resources on their land but there has been no formal effort to try to evaluate these (however subjectively)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action 4: Spatial delineation of the community**

**Objective**
To clearly agree and fix the boundaries of each communal area (carried out in conjunction with Action 3)

**Brief description**
\(^{i}\). To define the existing boundaries of the Township Chiefdoms, ensure that these are broadly accepted and clearly recognised by both the membership of a specific community and the neighbouring communities
\(^{ii}\). Using a GPS fix the boundaries so that they can be plotted accurately using a GIS

\(^{11}\) This should have already been a determining factor in making the selection of the 6 initial communities in that they should have had a sufficient NTFP, wildlife and timber resource base and should be bordering on LMNP
### III. Using the process of agreeing the boundaries and ensuring that they are agreed to build the capacity of the Township Council(s) and the Township membership to spatially plan for natural resource management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action no.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Primary responsibility</th>
<th>Contributing partners</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Walk boundaries with Township Council(s), define any contested areas, agree boundaries and fix the boundaries with a GPS</td>
<td>BCP</td>
<td>DC, FD &amp; TA</td>
<td>Year 1-2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Boundaries entered onto GIS, hard copies left with Township Councils</td>
<td>Township Chiefdoms geographic boundaries are already widely recognised although there may be some contested areas these are thought to be few in number. They have not been fixed using a GPS and accurately mapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2</td>
<td>Identify areas that may be jointly managed between communities (e.g. resources that are distributed between two neighbouring Township Chiefdoms, etc.)</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>FD</td>
<td>Year 2-3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>The arrangements between &quot;local communities&quot; for the access to resources that are spread across two or more Township Chiefdoms (e.g. an area of remaining forest, etc.) are not clearly understood. Many of these resources will need to be managed with the collaboration of two or more Townships (e.g. buffalo) and there are no formal arrangements in existence to achieve this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective**

To develop and formalise the internal governance of the Township Chiefdom sufficiently for effective natural resource management of common property resources
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action no.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Primary responsibility</th>
<th>Contributing partners</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief description</td>
<td>i. Develop a Constitution\textsuperscript{12} for each “community” or unit of management\textsuperscript{13}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Develop the internal Rules and regulations for the membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Develop the Constitution</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>DC &amp; BCP</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>There is likely to be informal agreements and formally agreed traditional norms but there is no formal Constitution for the internal governance of the Township Chiefdom as it relates to whole spectrum of natural resources available to the “community”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Develop the internal Rules &amp; Regulations</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>DC &amp; BP</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no formalised rules and regulations related to NTFP or wildlife management, utilisation and enterprises. There are however clearly accepted norms and behaviours that are expected of community members and are reinforced through social ties and peer pressure, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action 6: Developing a by-law(s)**

**Objective**
To legitimise the Township Chiefdoms (“community’s) authority and responsibility over forest resources on their land

**Brief description**
  
  i. Review the existing legislation to ensure conformity

  ii. Develop any necessary by-laws to support the development community-based natural resource management

\textsuperscript{12} A format for a Constitution is provided in Annex 1

\textsuperscript{13} It may be possible to develop a generic Constitution that is suitable for all of the “communities” or units of management
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action no.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Primary responsibility</th>
<th>Contributing partners</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Membership decides on those matters that need to be legitimised through by-laws</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>DC &amp; FD</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Description of by-laws</td>
<td>By-laws already exist developed through the TC, TA and DC however, there are no by-laws that specifically control natural resources and importantly, no by-laws that allow access to these resources by the “local community” but exclude others from the resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Preparation and approval of appropriate by-laws and ensure conformity with national legislation</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>FD</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>District by-laws that explicitly recognise the Township Chiefdoms Constitution, Rules &amp; Regulations to manage the forest resources on their land</td>
<td>As above, the District does not currently enact by-laws that specifically promote the sustainable utilisation of forest natural resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Develop District-level certification for locally produced forest natural resources</td>
<td>FD, DC</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Year 3 – 4</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Certification scheme</td>
<td>No certification scheme available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action 7: Devolution of management authority to the Township Chiefdom registered with the DC and FD to manage forest resources on their land**

**Objective**
To transfer the authority (the “power”) to the level of the local “community” and to empower them to make decisions regarding the day to day and long-term management of forest natural resources
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action no.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Primary responsibility</th>
<th>Contributing partners</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief description</td>
<td>i. Determine the process by which authority and responsibility(^{14}) can be transferred.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Review the Township Chiefdom Constitution, Rules &amp; Regulations, the</td>
<td>FD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Year 2 -</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Report to Minister</td>
<td>There are currently no condition by which authority and responsibility can be devolved to non-state actors to manage forest natural resources (outside of the protected areas)(^{15})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DC by-law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Approval by the Minister</td>
<td>FD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Certificate of Devolution</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Transfer ceremony(^{16})</td>
<td>FD &amp; DC</td>
<td>TA &amp; TC</td>
<td>Year 3 -</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Certificate of Devolution held by the Township Chiefdom</td>
<td>There has not been such a ceremony before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action 8: Developing Township and Section-level capacity to manage forest natural resources**

**Objective**

To ensure that the “local community” has sufficient capacity to manage the forest natural resources sustainably. Capacity building will take three forms (1) capacity building to manage the natural resources, (2) capacity building for internal governance and (3) capacity building to develop SMEs based upon the forest natural resource products.

\(^{14}\) It should be widely recognized that farmers, hunters and other resource users at the level of the community or Township Chiefdom are already largely responsible for the day to day management of forest natural resources on community land. However, they lack any legal status or authority to manage these resources sustainably because the authority is nominally vested in the FD.

\(^{15}\) Gola Forest NP is an example where there is collaborative management between the state (FD) and a non-state actor (the RSPB) but not the community.

\(^{16}\) While not essential the political significance of this process should not be underestimated as it represents a significant shift in policy approach towards the management of natural resources that has remained largely obsolete and unchanged since colonial times.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action no.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Primary responsibility</th>
<th>Contributing partners</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Identification of NGOs and other organisations capable of delivering capacity building and training (resource management, internal governance &amp; SME development)</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>FD</td>
<td>Year 1 - 3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>List of NGOs (and other organisation or agencies)</td>
<td>There are no NGOs with specific training in CBNRM currently in Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Capacity building of Township Chiefdoms in resource management (wildlife and NTFPs)</td>
<td>BCP</td>
<td>FD</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>TC-level NTFP and wildlife management plans</td>
<td>No such plan exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Training and development of TC-level timber utilisation plan</td>
<td>FD</td>
<td>TC, TA &amp; DC</td>
<td>Year 2 - 3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>TC-level timber utilisation plan</td>
<td>A plan exists for the utilisation of timber resources at this level but the TC (local communities) are not involved in its development or implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>Training and capacity building for internal governance</td>
<td>NGOs (other organisations and agencies)</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Year 2 - 5</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Accounting, meetings, recording (see M&amp;E section)</td>
<td>The TC Council provides a level of decision-making and conflict resolution that is arguably representative of the membership in as much as there is representation on the TC Council and this is broadly accepted by the membership who will abide by any decisions. However, the TC Council currently does not have any authority over forest resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Training and capacity building in the development of SMEs based upon (mainly but not exclusively) forest</td>
<td>NGOs (other organisations)</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Year 2 - 5</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Number of SMEs, household</td>
<td>A large proportion of local livelihood activity is based upon forest natural resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, it is difficult to develop these as SMEs because the resource base from which they obtain their raw materials is largely un-managed and many of the resources that they are utilising are de jure illegal (e.g. bushmeat), there is little incentive to invest in these SMEs because there is a question about their legality as well as the management the sustainable flow of products that they depend upon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action no.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Primary responsibility</th>
<th>Contributing partners</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Establish baseline indicators (qualitative &amp; quantitative)</td>
<td>BCP</td>
<td>TC, DC, TA &amp; FD</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>M&amp;E plan</td>
<td>There is currently no M&amp;E plan for biodiversity, livelihoods, governance, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Establish a procedure for meeting, reporting, evaluating and decision-making across the system (FD, DC, TA, Sections &amp; TC)</td>
<td>DC(^{17})</td>
<td>TA, FD, TC</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Revisions of the CAP</td>
<td>Planning is largely top down (through the DC) or opportunistic (through the TC) and does not include NTFPs or wildlife resources and tends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{17}\) The BCP will provide this in Year 2
### Action 10: Supporting the process

**Objective**
To ensure that there is a continued support to the process which will likely extend beyond the life of existing project support

**Brief description**
1. Develop a proposal for continuing support to the process recognising that the timescales for change within the community, institutions and the ecosystem generally extend beyond the lifetime of a project’s support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action no.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Primary responsibility</th>
<th>Contributing partners</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Develop a funding proposal for continued support to DC and TC</td>
<td>BCP</td>
<td>FD</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Submission of proposal</td>
<td>There is currently no provision for the continued support to the process of developing a system of natural resource management beyond the end of the BCP Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

In many ways it might be argued that the conflicting roles and responsibilities has contributed to the current situation and it is therefore important that there is a clear distinction between the role and responsibility of each participant in this process.

7.1. The Forest Department

Is the statutory agency for the management of forest or biodiversity resources in Sierra Leone. As such it is the authority for these resources but due to the lack of human, material and financial resources it struggles to effectively prosecute its responsibility. However, it remains the national regulator for biodiversity resources and is the principal “owner” and manager of the LMNP.

Within the CAP the FD will play a pivotal role by:

1. Providing the statutory environment and legitimacy to the CBNRM
2. Carrying out due diligence prior to the devolution of management rights to the community
3. Developing community-based timber management plans with approved communities

7.2. The District Council

The primary role of the DC is to develop a local-level strategy for development and prioritising the development needs of district residents. This is captured in District Development Plans. These plans, by the District Council, are developed in a participatory manner through their decentralised structures down to village level (village-wards-chiefdoms-district). These plans form the basis for the development strategy and action of the district. As such the local management of forest resources will be of primary concern to the DC both in terms of local livelihood security, opportunities for economic development and conventional mechanisms (e.g. market taxes, etc.) of raising revenues.

The DC is also tasked with local environmental management of which a CBNRM will play a pivotal role.

The DC has the authority to pass local bye-laws which are a key component in legitimising the CBNRM and ensuring that there is a legal basis for the Rules and Regulations developed at the Township Chiefdom level.

7.3. The Paramount Chiefdom

The PC is the highest office of the Traditional Authority and the custodian of the community lands. The TA provides the basis for communal land ownership and to a large extent can determine what happens on the land within its jurisdiction.

The PC and TA is also the highest level to which disputes within the community can be taken and is effectively the highest level at which collective decisions can be made and sanctions can be applied to transgressors.
As the CBNRM approach is based largely upon the existing system of communal land ownership the TA and the office of the PC is a key player in the process of developing and maintaining the system providing collectively agreed norms and rules as well as the channel through which community wishes can be established through bye-laws.

7.4. Section Chiefs

The SC represents a division within the TA that contains a number of Township Chiefdoms (TC). Its role is one of escalating decision-making and conflict resolution, adjudicating on disputes that cannot be resolved at the TC level or providing a basis by which decisions can be reached on issues that affect the membership of more than one TC. As such it plays a critical role in the CBNRM system by providing an existing mechanism of scale for management decisions.

7.5. Township Chiefdoms

This is the lowest level of the TA administration and also reflects land ownership providing the basis of owning and allocating (for farming) communal land. Effectively this structure most closely represents what we might call community although in effect it is further comprised of Families (each with a Head of household/family). It is likely that the TC will prove to be the most suitable level to be recognised as a unit of community management and to which the authority and responsibility for forest resources management can be devolved.

An important aspect of the TC is the Council of Elders which represents the Families. Made up of the Heads of Families this Council essentially represents an executive at the TC level. It is broadly democratic in as much as it appears to represent the membership through the Families.

As such it constitutes the first level of collective decision-making on issues relating to non-farm resources.

7.6. Heads of Families

The Family appears to be the first level of decision-making and conflict resolution at least as it relates to on farm issues and resources. It is represented on the Council of Elders by the Head of Family (who is normally an elder and considered wise decision-maker). The Family also represents the lowest level of land “ownership” through the farm, which is a collectively managed enterprise belonging to the Family.

---

18 It should be noted that there was a discussion on this issue and the conclusion was that formerly the Heads of Families had been mainly men but there were now some women Heads of Family and that these women could be on the Council of Elders. The CE also has a number of other members representing women and youth.
ANNEX 1 GUIDELINES FOR THE DRAFTING OF A CONSTITUTION

A Name by which it is known
What will be the name of the organisation be? This is a very important question and the name should reflect the aspirations of the members and the objective of the association.
- The name should readily identify the association to the people living in the community
- Avoid acronyms
- It can reflect the geographical area (e.g. LMNP. Township Chiefdom, etc.).
- It can reflect an objective an objective that the community aspire to (e.g. the “Tchuma Tchato” programme in Mozambique that means “Our Wealth”).

Incorporation (legal status)
The primary legal instrument for the constitution - in this case it will be the legal instrument for forming an association will likely be the new Wildlife Act and a District Council bye-law

Objectives
Simply put this section broadly sets out why people are establishing an association. Some important elements might include:
- Improve the livelihoods of farmers, hunters, collectors, processors, et al.
- Improve the security of the NTFP, timber and wildlife resource base that all of the above depend upon for their livelihoods.
- To protect the traditional heritage, culture and traditions of the community.
- To improve the land management and secure scarce natural resources.
- To protect any future use values and intellectual property of the local community.

Powers
This section sets out the powers that are given to the association. It also sets out the roles and responsibilities of the association and the individual members. Some of the powers might be:
- To regulate and control access to timber, NTFP, wildlife, farmland and fishery resources within the Township Chiefdom by outsiders and other members of the community.
- To establish rules and regulations regarding the use or these resources within Township Chiefdom.
- To raise revenue from members to further the aims and objectives of the association and to raise revenues for the District Council in return for specific services.

Membership
This section establishes who is a member of the association. This section will be one of the most critical from the perspective of the community. Considerable time will have to be spent working with the community at a number of levels to determine who should be members. In the final analysis this should be decided by the farmers, hunters, collectors, processors themselves.

Qualification
The qualification for membership will generate considerable debate and discussion. It is critical that it is the community who decide the qualifications and not "technical outsiders". This issue may raise disputes within the community and it is important that they are resolved at this level with only facilitation from the external supporting facilitators. As outsiders our role will be to facilitate such issues but not to resolve the disputes ourselves. Some of the major issues to be expected might revolve around the following:

- How is subsistence use catered for?
- How is commercial use catered for?
- Are all segments of society catered for?
- What is the role of women?
- How are conflicts with other resource users e.g. grazers, timber contractors, etc. resolved?
- What role will people living outside but with reasonable claims to residency play, etc?

**Honorary Members**

This is an option open to the community. They may wish for example to make a person who is not a member of the community but has contributed to the community an honorary member, for example the Paramount Chief. If this were a Trust this would be the same as a Patron. **Honorary members are not generally entitled to any financial benefits.**

**Ex-Officio Members**

An ex-officio member would generally be an outsider or an institution that the community would want to recognise without ascribing any voting powers. Such a person might be someone who could provide technical or legal advice.

**Representation**

Can a member be represented by another person? If so, how, and under what circumstances?

**Discipline**

If a person violates the rules of the constitution how are they to be disciplined?
How will members of the association enforce discipline on outsiders?
It is important in this section to understand existing control and disciplinary mechanisms that the community currently employs. You will need to consult closely with the Traditional Leaders and the any external facilitation on this issue.

**Termination**

This establishes the circumstances and steps by which membership of the association is terminated.
For example if a person no longer wishes to be involved in the collective management of the resources, processing or trade or if a person moves to another area or town outside the area of the association or other circumstances where the community would wish to terminate membership and why.

**Organisations and Officers**

Having set up the membership how is the membership going to organise itself effectively. We are providing a “model” or example here and it is not cast in stone; the community may wish to change this if they wish.
The Executive Board
Who should be a member of this Board (it will be the highest decision-making structure within the association)? In all likelihood this will be the Council of Elders but it is important to determine the relationship of this group with the membership, the Township Chief, Section Head, etc.
- What will their powers be?
- How are the different interests (collectors, hunters, farmers, fishers, traders, etc.) represented on the Board?
- Are there other members? If so who?
- Are there any ex-officio members?
- How is the Chairman/woman elected/selected?
- What about the role of woman?

Other Committees in the association
Are there going to be interest groups (represented by subcommittees) within the association?
If so what are they? Who should be members of these committees? How is the chairman/woman elected/selected?

Powers and Duties of the Board members
For each of the below it is necessary to look at the role and function of each of the officers. Some of the issues involved here are:
- How are meetings called?
- What are the decision-making procedures?
- Presentation of accounts.
- Maintaining a record of meetings.
- Dissemination of decisions and communication.
- Term of office for Board members and officers.
- Removal from office.
- Quorum\(^\text{19}\) for meetings.

Chairman and Vice Chairman (male or female)
How is the Vice Chairman elected/selected?
What is the relationship between the Chairman and Vice Chairman and the Traditional Leaders?

Secretary
Qualifications for the Secretary such as the ability to read and write.
Will they be salaried?

Treasurer
Qualifications for the position of Treasurer.
Will they be salaried?

Financial

\(^{19}\) A quorum is the minimum people required to vote on a decision. Normally this is a majority of the Board and should be an odd number (e.g. 5 or 7 of 10 but not 6).
This section deals with the financial structure of the association and one of the issues here will be how funds are to be managed by the association/community Board.

**Income**
How will the association income be generated?  
How will the association collect income?  
Where are the monies collected by the association kept?

**Expenditure**
How will the association spend money?  
How will expenditure be decided upon and who will authorise expenditure?

**Fees**
What percentage of revenue generated by the trade in forest resources will go to the association?  
What percentage of revenue generated by the trade in forest resources will go to the District Council, if any?  
Apart from revenue generated when forest resources are traded are there any other sources of income (e.g. timber concessions, etc.)?

**Accounts**
How are monies going to be accounted for?  
How will this be kept transparent to the membership?

**Meetings**
Covered to some extent in earlier sections, this section will deal with how meetings are called and organised. Important issues here are notification of a meeting, setting a quorum and dissemination of proceedings. Thought must be given to the practicalities and logistics of calling meetings.

**Ordinary**
An ordinary meeting refers to a meeting of the association Board.  
- How are these called?  
- Quorum for the meeting?  
- Dissemination of proceedings?

**Annual General Meeting**
The annual general meeting is for all members and could be given a local name for an annual meeting. The calling and structure of this meeting should be examined. It is where the association executive will be held accountable to the membership.

**General Regulations**
The general regulations are an important section of the constitution and much thought will have to go into this section. It may be necessary to create further sub-sections or prepare a separate regulation document that this constitution will refer to. It is the intent of this programme to promote forest resource use as a viable and sustainable land use option and this needs to be recognised in developing the regulatory framework. It will be counter-productive to have regulations that are unnecessarily restrictive on the use of these resources. Some of the issues that need to be addressed here are:
Who has access to the forest resources?
What is the difference between forest resources used for subsistence and those that are traded?
Where will these resources be sold? How will this be regulated?
Will outsiders be allowed to collect these resources in Township Chiefdom and how will this be regulated?
Will there be a quota system and if so how will this operate?
How will harvest rates be determined?
Certain species (types) of forest resources may not be collected. What are these? How will this be controlled or enforced?
How will harvests be recorded? Who will keep these records?

**Expansion of the Association**
This section is a brief statement that allows other communities to be added to the association. However, you may wish to set certain over-riding conditions in the case of expansion. Such conditions must be in agreement with the Traditional Authority, District Council and the national legislation.

**Constitutional Amendments**
This section addresses the procedures to be followed in the case of an amendment to the constitution. This involves the steps of notification/consultation and voting. It also covers who is allowed to propose an amendment.

**Relationship to Government, Traditional Authority and Other Organisations**
This section is to be completed in consultation with the Traditional Authority (Paramount Chief) District Council, Forestry Division and LMNP. It provides the operational guidelines for the association and these external entities. It outlines for example how the FD will relate to the association in respect to law enforcement, research and monitoring. It is the section that spells out the “contract” between the association, Traditional Authority, District Council and the Government (FD).
### IMPACT INDICATORS

*These indicators help us track how CBNRM is delivering conservation benefits contributing to improving local livelihoods, developing social capital in rural communities and contributing to the national economy*

1. Conservation/ Natural Resource Management indicators
2. Livelihood indicators
3. Social capital indicators
4. National economy indicators

### ENABLING ENVIRONMENT

To achieve the intended impacts, CBNRM requires an enabling environment which consists of: (i) devolved NRM rights and powers; (ii) viable market; (iii) safety and security; (iv) sufficient capital investment; and (v) sufficient and capable technical support

1. Devolution indicators
2. Market indicators
3. Safety and security indicators
4. Capital investment indicators
5. Support provision indicators

### LOCAL CAPACITY

To achieve the intended impacts CBNRM requires practical local delivery mechanisms such as skilled people, good governance structures, sufficient resources for management. People complying with local by-laws and national laws

1. Sufficient skill indicators
2. Clean governance structures indicators
3. Sufficient resources and systems indicators
4. Compliance indicators
5. Doing the ‘right things’ indicators

### ADEQUATE RESOURCE BASE

To achieve the intended impacts CBNRM needs to be based on a resource base that has the capacity to achieve expectations. The following indicators try to evaluate alternative land use potentials and match these to the social demands.

1. Land use potential indicators