

FINAL REPORT and PROCEEDINGS OF FOREST SPECIFIC SEMINARS

ON

NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN TRANSMARA

TDP Report No. 84

(Seminar organised under the auspices of TDP/GTZ and funded by the Konrad
Adenauer Stiftung)

(10th March - 5th April 1997)

Dr. O. Odek
Ms. E. Keli

June 1997

*Current Stage
of NRM +
LUP*

- Prohibition to work with communities has hampered further progress.
- Half-hearted permission given due to pressure from Nairobi.
- Local leaders (Prov. Admin, MP, Clerk, etc.) fear loss of power over resources.

FINAL REPORT and PROCEEDINGS OF FOREST SPECIFIC SEMINARS ON

NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN TRANSMARA

(Seminar organized under the auspices of TDP/GTZ and funded by the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung)

(10th March - 5th April 1997)

Between February and August 1996, the Transmara Development Program (TDP) commissioned consultants to carry out a study on natural resources in Transmara. The findings of the study are contained in a report dated August 1996 entitled "FOREST RESOURCES IN TRANSMARA: CONSERVATION, MANAGEMENT AND LEGAL ISSUES". The report was presented to the TDP at a workshop held in Kericho on 20th and 21st June 1996. One resolution of the Kericho workshop was that the study results and recommendations as well as the resolutions of the Kericho workshop should be disseminated to the administrative personnel and the local communities of Transmara district. To this end, numerous seminars and workshops have been held.

A Chief's seminar was held at TDP Offices, Lolgorien, on the 14th and 15th of August 1996. Subsequent to this, a Leader's meeting was held on 18th October 1996 at Kilgoris. One of the resolutions of the Leader's meeting was that "seminars be held and conducted within the district with a view to training the communities on the importance of forest conservation." In pursuance of the resolution of the Leader's meeting, TDP in conjunction with the District Administration of Transmara organized divisional seminars in Transmara between 25th and 29th November 1996. Subsequent to the divisional seminars, between 10th March and 5th April 1997, forest specific seminars were held. The forest specific seminars were organized by TDP and funded by the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung. The seminars focused on the following forest areas: Nyakueri, Laila, Olenkapune, Olomismis, Lookwaya, Esoit-Naibor and Kirindon.

The communities living around these forest areas were targeted for awareness creation. To this extent, it was planned that the following communities should attend and participate in the seminars: Sitoka community, Kawai/Olesheti community, Olkiriruki-Olorosoito community, Pusangi community, Laila community, Olalui community, Lookwaya community, Kirindon community, Esoit Naibor community, Olenkapune-Olomotonyi community and Metanguar community.

In all communities, the seminars were led by two consultants namely, Dr. James Kiyiapi of the Department of Forestry at Moi University and Dr. Otieno-Odek from the Faculty of Law, University of Nairobi.

The seminars organized for Kirindon and Lookwaya communities did not take place.

In Lookwaya, the community was not prepared for the seminar. They had been informed of it but only a few elders turned up. The area Chief was supposed to have held a meeting with the

community a week before the seminar to brief the members on the objective of the seminar. The Chief's meeting did not take place. The few elders who turned up were briefed on the purposes of the seminar and the elders proposed that a new date for the forest/wildlife awareness creation seminar should be fixed.

In Kirindon, the seminar did not take place as nobody came to the venue of the meeting. The consultants were unable to find the area Chief. However, the consultants did find the District Officer who stated that he was very new in his station and was not aware of the planned seminar. The District Officer hoped that there would be a chance in future for such a seminar.

In all other areas, the seminars took place as planned.

This report is divided into five parts and three appendices namely: Part A on forest/wildlife issues; Part B on legal issues and Part C on discussions and issues raised by seminar participants; Part D on recommendations of forest specific seminars and Part E on the way forward. Appendix One contains the names of committee members elected to oversee forest and wildlife conservation; appendix two gives the dates and areas where the seminars were held.

PART A: FOREST/WILDLIFE ISSUES

Dr. Kiyiapi made a presentation on forest and wildlife issues in the context of the socio-economic and cultural setting of various localities. Based on previous divisional seminars, a deliberate effort was made to address issues that had been raised by the local people with a view to provoking and stimulating discussion. General conservation objectives and values vis-a-vis development issues were addressed. Examples were drawn from other parts of the country, the district and specific forest areas to illustrate potential benefits of conservation to the communities. Existing forest resource benefits and constraints already recognized by communities were outlined.

Based on the above, Dr. Kiyiapi addressed various themes. First, land was recognized as the basic resource with competing land-use alternatives (human settlements, agriculture, livestock husbandry, natural resources conservation- soil, water, forest and wildlife resources).

Second, the value of forests in terms of timber and non-timber products was emphasized. The value of forests was explained to encompass the provision of timber, building posts, bee keeping role, fencing materials, firewood, medicine, grazing and salt licks. In terms of conservation function, forests were stated to aid in soil and water conservation, climate moderation, aesthetic values and wildlife habitat. In terms of socio-cultural aspects, it was underscored that forests have a sacred role and ceremonial functions.

Third, the current prices (Ksh/m³) of some commercial timber species commonly found in most forests of Transmara were presented to illustrate that selective felling of trees into timber would fetch far more to the land owner compared to the wasteful conversion into charcoal. It was demonstrated that if management plans were developed, most land owners would benefit from

controlled and well executed timber extraction.

Fourth, slides of different forest blocks were shown. The slides illustrated forest types and variety of sites (e.g., areas of communal use such as salt licks, beautiful scenery that could be exploited in eco-tourism development); different tree species available in Transmara, forests of various disturbance intensities (from undisturbed to heavily degraded forests); dry season grazing forests and forests containing high concentrations of wildlife.

PART B: LEGAL ISSUES

Dr. Otieno-Odek made a presentation on legal issues relating to forest and wildlife resource management in Transmara. Dr. Odek explained that land is three dimensional. It denotes the surface, the airspace and the sub-terrenean geospace below the soil surface. Land includes land covered with water, all things growing on land, buildings and other things permanently affixed to land. This includes things attached to the earth; things rooted in the earth as in the case of trees and shrubs and what is imbedded in the earth as in the case of walls or buildings.

Pertaining to ownership of forests, Dr. Otieno-Odek stated that there are four categories of forest owners in Transmara namely, the county council, group ranches, community forests in trust land and private/individual forests. There are no government forests in the district. On wildlife, Dr. Odek noted that all wildlife found in Kenya whether on private, trust or public land is owned by the state. The Kenya Wildlife Society does not own the wildlife.

Various participants in the seminars wanted to know what the law was in relation to wildlife compensation. Dr. Odek explained that in Kenya, presently, compensation for wildlife damage is only payable for loss of life or bodily injury. No compensation is due for damage to crops or property.

Relating to forest management options, Dr. Odek explained to the seminar participants that forest management must be distinguished from forest ownership. The owner of a specific forest can decide to either manage the forest resource by itself, or engage a third party to manage the forest. It was noted that in order to conserve and manage the Transmara forests under the present legal framework, the community who are owners of the forest resources may choose from the following three options:

- (i) The owner(s) can manage the forest directly;
- (ii) The owner(s) can give the management of the forests to the County Council and
- (iii) The management of the forests can be contracted out to other bodies such as the Forest Department, KWS or private enterprises.

The following forest management options were presented and discussed by the participants. In areas where the land adjudication process has been completed, it was recommended that where the entire forest land has been divided, individuals who end up having forests allocated to them should come together and form an association of forest owners. In this scenario, the individuals continue to own

their land individually only that they form an association of forest owners. These individual forest land owners will be the members of the association and as such, they constitute a community. The individuals will then come up with a forest zonation and management plan. They will also make rules and regulations governing the rights of access to and use of the forest resources. They can also enter into a management agreement with a third party to manage the forest either at a fee or in return for some other consideration. In areas where the land adjudication process is incomplete, it was recommended that specific forest areas be set aside. In this case, the owners of the forest will be the community members who will be defined as those persons who live or reside within the specific forest.

PART C: DISCUSSIONS and ISSUES RAISED BY PARTICIPANTS

The following issues were raised in all the forest specific seminars.

1. Forest Destruction

Since the recent land demarcation, there has been excessive forest destruction, charcoal burning and indiscriminate felling of trees in Transmara. It was unclear whether this could be linked to the realization by some people, that they do not have a forest portion on their land parcels. At the Olenkapune/Olomotonyi seminar, the participants wanted to know if the provincial administration was aware of the nature and extent of forest destruction going on and if so, whether there are permits issued for tree felling. On this issue, Dr. Kiyapi explained that anyone felling trees require a permit. The area Chief, the District Forest Office and the District Commissioner's Office must all give approval.

2. Land ownership and management

Most of the seminar participants remarked that they own the Transmara land and forests situated on Trust Land. A general sentiment was that they wanted to solely manage their forests without outside help. To the participants, forests provide their total livelihood in social-cultural and economic sense with benefits such as dry season grazing, salt-licks, medicinal plants, honey, shade, rain, water catchment and building material.

3. Human-wildlife conflict

Most of the participants expressed that there is an urgent need to find a solution to the human-wildlife conflict. It was noted that there is minimal compensation for loss of human life and virtually no compensation for loss of livestock and damage to property. To most participants, there are no wildlife benefits of any kind and the degree of sacrifice borne by the maasai should be met with matching benefits. At the Metanguar community seminar in Olomismis, a participant observed that if wildlife belongs to someone else other than the maasai, let the owner take them away. He further remarked aloud that the maasai are a livestock community and if wildlife kills livestock without

compensation, what are the maasai supposed to eat? At the Olalui seminar, a participant commented that whereas there are potential benefits from both wildlife and forests, the issue of concern to the Maasai is how to identify various possible options/alternatives on how the potential benefits could be realized. It was further emphasized that the community would like all benefits emanating from forests/wildlife resources to come to them directly without passing through the county council.

4. Community awareness and mobilization

During the general discussions and deliberations of the seminar, the participants expressed the need for continuation of seminars at the grass roots level in order to establish clear understanding of sustainable forest conservation by the community and leaders. To this extent, the participants expressed the desire to protect and manage their own forests using the existing indigenous knowledge and practices without unwarranted external pressure.

5. Technical support

The communities, particularly those of Sitoka, Olenkapune and Kawai, expressed the need for technical support in the formation of associations of land and forest owners. There was also expressed the desire to have training on sustainable management principles on how to conserve forests and how to facilitate eco-tourism. The specific details of training are:

- drawing of the articles of association for the groups.
- introduction of Income Generating Activities based on forest and wildlife resources.

6. Financial support

In all the seminars attended, the participants observed that there is need for financial support to start income generating activities and social development projects such as schools and health centres. Such income generating activities will bring needed cash to local communities as an alternative money-earner to forest destruction in form of charcoal and timber.

The Seminar participants were informed that on the technical and financial issues, TDP had consulted with the European Union who had shown an interest in supporting forest/wildlife activities in Transmara.

7. Timber sales

In relation to timber products, the seminar participants observed that genuine commercial timber traders should be found to bid for debarked and mature trees in the forests. The proceeds from such sales can finance schools, cattle dips and other social development projects. In line with this thought, the Sitoka community suggested that debarked trees should be sold at current timber prices.

8. Community Participation

The seminar participants noted that community participation in decision-making on matters related to their development, such as choice of projects should receive funding\support. In this regard, community-based "forest management committees" were proposed for all the forests. It was recommended that the committees should have responsibility for the protection and conservation of forests. It was observed that community-based forest management will flush out cattle rustlers who hide in the forests. Finally, as a matter of urgency, the participants suggested that any future decisions on land and/or forests should be taken with full community participation.

9. Community education on forest resources

One issue that was recommended by the participants involved community education on available trees, plants and user value. Participants recommended that assistance in market survey on sale of timber, medicinal plants and resource management should be given.

10. Land Adjudication

Pertaining to the land adjudication process, the seminar participants were of the view that the communities need to be up-dated on the land adjudication in the district. In areas where the adjudication process is complete, the view was that zonation of forests for settlement, grazing and agriculture should be done. In the Olomismis area, the seminar participants made a request to TDP to consider if TDP can map the demarcated parcels of land so that if the community decides to set aside forests, the owners should easily be known. Further, the participants wanted to know the extent to which TDP can help in ascertaining or resolving boundary issues. On this issue, the TDP representative, Mr. Paul Borsy, stated that TDP has no mandate to deal with land and it cannot adjudicate, divide or resolve land/boundary disputes. On the issue of mapping, it was suggested that the Olomismis community can make a written request to TDP for consideration.

At the Pusangi seminar, the participants noted that one of their problems related to land adjudication and the sub-division of land. The community in this area were not sure whether they were in a group ranch or in an adjudication section. To most of the participants, they believed that they were in Kimintet area but were uncertain whether it was an adjudication section or group ranch. The community was of the view that whereas they may be able to set aside some forest for conservation, they need some guidance on how to make a forest management plan.

11. Need for Forest management plan in Nyakueri

The seminar participants from the communities surrounding the Nyakueri forest were of the view that a joint management plan needs to be produced to foster sustainable conservation, utilization and protection of the forest. There was need for TDP and other relevant government agencies to facilitate the preparation of the plan in conjunction with the local communities.

At the Kawai/Olosheti seminar, the participants were of the view that Nyakweri forest should be seen as belonging to various communities such as Pusangi, Sitoka, Kilae, Oloro Soito and Olosheti. It was strongly recommended that all these communities should be involved in discussing the future of Nyakweri.

12. Wildlife and tourism benefits

The seminar participants discussed the issue of human-wildlife conflict and came up with the idea that communities should be helped to enter into the wildlife and tourism market. The goal herein is to make the maasai lifestyle compatible with the tourism trade and benefits thereof to be received directly by the local communities.

13. Women's Participation in forest conservation

During the seminars, it was noted that women are forest resources users and should participate in its management. Forest-related income generating activities that benefit women need to be formulated.

14. Wildlife and forest association

At the end of each community seminar, the community members agreed on the need to form an association to protect and manage the forest resources. The pending issue was whether there is to be an association per community and per group ranch. It was noted that the land adjudication status for each area will determine what action shall be taken. It was recommended that each community association should have a forest management committee. The roles and functions of the committee are to be drawn by the members. However, at the Laila community seminar, an issue that was raised pertained to the role of the County Council in the forest/wildlife association. One participant observed that if the community forms the association, what would be the role of the county council in the association and vice-versa?

15. Wildlife-livestock conflict

All participants at the various forest specific seminars agreed that there is rampant wildlife-livestock conflict in Transmara. Conflict is over grazing and water resources, coupled with the spread of disease. It was a general consensus that ways and means should be found to compensate communities for loss of pasture and wildlife damage to livestock. There was a strong feeling that if benefits from wildlife cannot reach the communities directly, then they should not be paid at all.

16. Wildlife-agriculture conflict

The participants further noted that since their land is in the maasai mara dispersal area, there is no cultivation due to wildlife. It was the view of the participants that compensation for non-cultivation and loss of livestock should be paid. In reaction to this view, the KWS Transmara District Warden

Mr. Too informed the seminar participants that KWS has a community partnership program for communities in wildlife dispersal areas to jointly care for and benefit from wildlife. This program is being done through wildlife related income generating activities.

17. Transparency and partnership

On the issue of partnerships with outside organizations, it was the view of the participants that first they need to clearly understand what the partnership entails and be sure what type of benefits are to be forthcoming to the community. All in all, in any partnership arrangement, the communities must not lose ownership of their land and forests.

18. Donor support requirements

The participants resolved that community committees and associations should be informed of donor requirements and pre-requisites to funding. For example, the timing of project proposal and the fact that most donors are attracted by community projects as opposed to individual projects should be emphasized. Further, the community needs information on what kind of income generating activities should be embarked upon.

19. Relationship between the community forest conservation committees/associations and the County Council

The participants of the seminar noted with concern that the relationship between the community and the county council pertaining to ownership and utilization of forest resources is not cordial. To this end, it was recommended that ways and means be found to normalize the relations and sort out any mistrust between the two entities.

20. Wildlife barriers

Noting that human-wildlife conflict exists in Transmara, the participants were of the view that the fencing of Laila forest to keep off elephants should be raised with KWS. This would enable the community to carry out some agricultural activities.

21. Need for District co-ordination association/forum

Noting that the seminar participants recommended the formation of forest associations, the same participants were of the view that when all community forest and wildlife associations have been formed, there should be a district co-ordination association whereby representatives from all community associations will meet and formulate policy issues on conservation and utilization of forest resources. The district forum should deal with outside agencies interested in eco-tourism and other ventures, share costs on promotion, plan and carry out relevant training and education for various actors.

22. Legal information

The seminar participants expressed the view that the local community has a dearth understanding of the relevant laws relating to wildlife and forest conservation, the chiefs authority act and the details on how associations/communities can benefit from conservation efforts. To this extent, it was recommended that there is need to disseminate legal information on the above.

23. Forest security

The issue of forest security was one item discussed in the various seminars. The participants recommended that community scouts should be trained to carry out forest patrols. The scouts will also be invaluable to the extent that they have indigenous knowledge on the forests and their familiarity with the forest terrain will result in faster movement for security and communication purposes.

24. Permits for the tree cutting

One issue that kept recurring during the seminars related to the issuance of permits for felling/cutting of trees in forests. To many participants, it was not clear who issues permits, how many and from what office. It was recommended that issuance of permits should be co-ordinated to avoid abuse of authority. This was deemed a must to save the forests.

25. Forest and wildlife protection committees

In four forest specific seminars at Sitoka, Kawai, Olkiriruki/Olorosoito and Olenkapune/Olmotonyi, the participants formed forest and wildlife protection committees. In other seminars, the participants requested time to discuss and consider who shall be elected as committee members. In areas where committees were formed, the names of the committee members are annexed hereto as Appendix One.

The roles of the committee were outlined to be: forest protection against internal and external destruction, coordinating forest conservation and utilization issues with neighbouring communities, representing the specific forest members to higher authorities and other communities, setting up forest user rules in conjunction with all community members and liaise with forest marketing agencies. A major issue that was emphasised was that the committee members do not own the forests and in the course of their duties, the committee must act in liaison with all community members.

Other functions of the committee were outlined as:

- i) facilitate community functions;
- ii) select and mark trees for timber;
- iii) facilitate communication between the community and outside agencies;

- iv) be partners in wildlife conservation and management;
- v) protect forests from wanton and illicit destruction;
- v) participate in the zonation of forests;
- vi) assist in the identification of community scouts for training;
- vii) help in identifying forest users and user rights;
- viii) set user guidelines;
- ix) meet regularly and review different aspects of the forest resource;
- x) assist in the development of forest and wildlife management plans and
- xi) assist in the development of income generating activities.

PART D: RECOMMENDATIONS OF FOREST SPECIFIC SEMINARS

The following are the recommendations and resolutions from all the forest specific seminars.

1. The whole of Nyakueri forest, all riverine and hill forests should be protected - these are the areas that should be set aside and conserved as forests; it is highly recommended that such areas should not be subdivided into individual parcels. Forest ecosystem management requires that the major forest blocks are not fragmented and subdivision into small holdings is likely to lead to uncontrolled fragmentation. But given the controversy surrounding land ownership in the district, the preferred option would have to be developed through an open process of deliberation with land owners.
2. Forests should be zoned into different use-categories; e.g. areas where limited use is allowed (timber, building posts, fencing materials), areas where cultivation is allowed, rangelands, wildlife corridors and areas to be left completely intact. The major constraints at present seems to be that there is still largely unclarified land ownership in some parts of the district. For example, a forest block like Nyakueri falls under an adjudication section while some parts of the forest such as the Olorien area is alleged to be in a group ranch (unincorporated?). Zonation is ideally a land use mapping and practicable only in areas where ownership is not contentious. It would appear therefore that zonation should only be carried out in areas where land ownership is fully determined.
3. The forests should not be fragmented. Continuity between forest blocks should be maintained.
4. In Nyakueri, subsistence cultivation should be strictly limited to open glades near settled areas; technical help from District Forest Office should be sought before such cultivation is carried out.
5. In areas like Kirindon, land owners should set a "buffer limit" beyond which no farming and charcoal burning activities (currently common in the area) are allowed. Where a permit for clearing has been issued, farmers should be advised to leave all valuable timber species until a market for them is found. Eucleas (Olkinyei) and Trichocladus (Olmashirashi) can be cleared.

6. Forest protection committees should be formed. These committees should organize and hold discussions with other community members to set forest use rules. It should be emphasized however, that these are NOT forest or land allocation committees - they are simply working committees which provide a vital link to the community. Formation of these committees should be seen as an initial stage towards mobilization and formation of forest/wildlife association.
7. Mobilize local people to start planning together with government departments, Transmara County Council (TCC), TDP and where necessary supporting consultants for a participatory forest/wildlife management plan. This need not be detailed initially as data is largely unavailable on a number of aspects.

PART E: THE WAY FORWARD

Based on the presentations, questions raised and discussions, the following fundamental issues must be addressed in order to push the conservation process forward:

Institutional collaboration

It has now become apparent that the relevant institutions in Transmara have not agreed on the approach to attaining forest conservation goals. However, there is consensus on the need to conserve the dwindling forest resources of the district. A pre-requisite to natural resource conservation is a clearly defined institutional framework. Institutional rivalry or disharmony defeats conservation objectives. This matter should be treated with the seriousness it deserves and a common approach should be found. Central to all the 'way forward discourse' are the people of Transmara - the land owners at whose expense and for whose benefit these resources should be conserved. A natural resource workshop to which all relevant stakeholders are invited should provide a forum in which an agreed framework can be developed.

Ownership Question

Forest/wildlife conservation and management revolves around land ownership and ultimately on the distribution of benefits. Formation of forest/wildlife association is only possible where precise boundaries of the resource is known and claims to ownership ascertainable. Various options of constituting communities into legal entities are possible and these must be thoroughly explored -this means that people themselves should clearly understand and appreciate the options open to them.

Technical Support

Technical support is very crucial to this entire process. Once an agreed framework has been developed, technical support will be needed in the following specific areas:

- Preparation of training materials and training of forest/wildlife scouts (guides)
- Local institutional capacity building in general
- Identification of tangible forest/wildlife related benefits/income generating projects
- Determination of sustainable levels of forest product extraction
- Developing equitable benefit sharing mechanisms
- Data collection and formulation of participatory forest specific management plans.

This is a long term process requiring massive human and capital investment. A 3-4 year comprehensive natural resource conservation project would need to be developed to address all the above issues and funding solicited from various sources. The European Union has shown an interest and the lead agencies in Transmara must strive to satisfy the pre-requisites mentioned above to capture this source of funding. It need not be overemphasized that the entire strategy should be people-oriented.

Appendix 1
Forest and wildlife committees in Trans Mara
Status May 97

Sitoka forest and wildlife Committee

1. Parsiria Melubo
2. Ole Parsaloi Kaka
3. Murmet Oleuma
4. Parsoilal Kiloyian
5. Julius Melubo
6. Ta? Kiloyian
7. Daniel Kaka
8. Julius Nekencha
9. Noolkilisu Melubo
10. Naisianoi Oledio
11. Samantare Parsoilal

Olosheti/Kawai Forest and wildlife Committee

1. Lekishon Ole Maasae (chairman)
2. Daniel Ole Kuyia (secretary)
3. Susuanka ?riayu (treasury)
4. Ole Meisidia
5. Salepo Ole Mamai
6. Ntaayie N. Karia
7. Kirusua Tunai
8. Napolos Enekuyia
9. Ole Moronko Meriayu
10. Nooseuri Saruni
11. Naitaywana Lankas

Olomismis Afforestation Committee

1. Samson Ole Kalamoyo
2. David Ole Kirionki
3. Susana Murrampi
4. Elizabeth Kirua
5. Jonathan Ketere
6. Noonkipa Kipasenua
7. Olenkoirien Kalema
8. Oloisiriri Kipintoi
9. Staphan Keshe
10. David Koisikir
11. Ex-off Chairman Group Ranch

Olmontonyi forest and willife association

1. Francis Ole Nenkuseyo
2. Peter Kunasei
3. Samuel Sakaja
4. Kuresoi Ole Naisuaku
5. Ynantai Samperu
6. Tranka Leto
7. Sariku Nkaliyia
8. Talala Koikoti
9. Noolkitoip Antony
10. Nooseuri Kanoi
11. Noosisi Ole Ngutie

Olootopisianoi (Pusangi) Forest Conservation Committee

1. Opiyo Ole Naginda (chairman)
2. Shadrack Ole Seiyo (secretary)
3. Saitoti Ole Kimeita (treasurer)
4. Tumpes Ole Naginda
5. Munyenye Ole Kashan
6. Kintungat Ole Karia
7. Mashau Kikanai
8. Ole Tanjenuo Mamai
9. Oloorugaa Oloolkiroro
10. Ole Korore Koila
11. Mosori Ole Naginda
12. Yianto Ole Seyio
13. Ole Sulel Mamai

Olkirriruki/ Olorok Soito forest and willife committee

1. Ole Mbirika Kakui
2. Samuel Naiduya
3. Antony Mpeti
4. Francis Mopel
5. Ole Mampai
6. Samuel Naikada
7. Peter Kokui
8. Ole Sayialel Parmeres
9. Sasi Oloolgiso
10. Mataro Noomisigiyo
11. Noolmirisho Nkilapus

Appendix 2

Dates and areas of seminars

| Venue | Date | No. of participants |
|------------------------|------------------|---|
| Sitoka | 10.03. | 76 |
| Pusangi | 11.03. | 49 |
| Olkiruki/ Olorok Soito | 13.03. 16.03. | cancelled by TCC not recorded (about 25) |
| Kawai | 14.03. | 53 |
| Sitoka | 20.03. | not recorded (about 40) |
| Nenteke/Laila | 21.03. | 79 |
| Olalui | 22.03. | 34 |
| Olmontonyi | 24.03. | 77 |
| Olomismis | 02.04. | 105 |
| Ilokwaya | 03.04. | 16 |
| Esoit Naibor | 04.04. | 39 |
| Kirindon | 05.04. | failed |