

DISSENTING POSITION ON THE PROPOSED ZONING SCHEME

Preamble

While the four of us with names and signatures above, agree with most of part of the MLUM report, we have decided to express our dissenting position on the proposed zoning scheme. We have taken such a position after noting that some of critical concerns expressed by the community have not been appreciated and captured by some of the MLUM team. Herewith, we provide the reasons for the dissenting position and make some recommendations.

REASONS FOR THE POSITION TAKEN

1. In recognizing the ecologically and culturally outstanding areas, the NCA community has accepted to leave a significant part (37% for conservation core zone and 45% for transition zone) in the NCA such as the Ngorongoro, Empakai and Olmoti Craters and Ndutu marshes. Other areas include Oldupai and Laitole palaeontological and archeological sites. This means that out of 8100kms² (use the extended area size) only 18% has been left for settlements and development zone. It is important to note that such outstanding areas have been essential refuges for livestock during both early rains and dry seasons. However, successive droughts have prompted the need to access range and water in the NHFR.
2. The NCA community has proposed for internal adjustments within wards and villages based on their knowledge on ecology from long use and importance as a way to ensure that the integrity and quality of the outstanding resources and values of the NCA are protected for the nation and global community. This acceptance is geared at providing space for the transition zone (continue co-existence). In particular, the community has also consented to retreat from the villages that are in close proximity to the Craters to relieve pressure from the Ngorongoro Crater, Ormoti, Embakaai and NHFR.
3. Despite second phase consultations with the NCA communities in the 11 wards following the 22nd September 2019, meeting with the Minister for Natural Resources and Tourism where it was agreed that the **zoning exercise** should be approached with a human face, some

of MLUM team members seem to hold onto proposed abolishment of 14 villages (a zone without people and livestock). Even with in-depth discussions and sharing our ecological knowledge, we have failed to reach a consensus on the removal of some villages from the proposed 'core' zone.

4. The ToR (paragraph 1 & 2) guides the MLUM team to designate villages that qualify for title deeds and those which qualify for village with restrictions. While, the move to qualify some villages as settlement and development is highly welcomed by the NCA community, the villages (settlements) with restrictions will; provide space for internal resettlement; range for dispersal of wildlife and livestock and promote peoples' positive attitude towards wildlife as they co-existence and derive benefits from conservation. Villages that will receive title deeds are bound to conform to land use plans and any other restrictions/regulations that will be instituted accordingly.
5. Refusing to adjust to community views and opinions on proposed resettlement adjustments offered by them will continue to reinforce a perceived bias as to whether there was no predetermined decision preceding the proposed zones designed by the MLUM team.
6. Removing villagers (villages) without substantiated risks give the government unnecessary burden of resettling thousands of people (around 80,000).
7. The proposed transition zone is only in the lowlands and short-grass plains characterized of erratic rainfall thus unavailability of water and utilized by wildebeest during calving season (January to March) which transmit MCF. The absence of the transition zone in highlands which are refuge grazing for livestock during dry season will potential lead to poor health...
8. We believe the concept behind the MLUM review was to identify critical outstanding (hotspots) for conservation and not all villages have critical hotspots as established in the 2006-2016 NCA-GMP and as such there is no reason for removing the entire village,
 - a. For example, while Mokilal is 7.5 km and Irmisigiyo is 14km, respectively from the rim of the Ngorongoro Crater (hotspot), as such none has any critical

ecological significant hotspot. The *Acacia Lahai* and *Juniperous procera* “cedar” forest between Misigiyo and Endulen was accepted as a critical dry season refuge for livestock and wildlife. No significant degradation of the forest resources have vividly surfaced. In addition, the two villages have well established social infrastructure such as dispensaries, schools, dams, piped water and cattle dip and crushes as well as a gravel road.

- b. Bulati and Sendui villages have been grazing grounds for livestock and away from the hotspots namely the Empakai Crater and the North Highland Forest Reserve.

9. In the light of the above, we suggest the following villages to continue existing

Under the MLU restrictions or settlement and development status 1. **Mokilal.** 2 **Misigiyo** 3. **Kaitakiteng’** 4. **Sendui** 5. **Nainokanoka** 6. **Bulati.**7. **Naiyobi** 8. **Itulele.** 9. **Kapenjiro** 10. **Irkeepusi** and 11. **Oloirobi** 12. **Kayapus** 13. **Alaitole** 14.

The legal opinion given in the team (i.e. no settlements are established under the Tanzanian Land law system) implies that the massive land is lost to conservation.

- The legal opinion given in the team (i.e. no settlements are established under the Tanzanian Land law system) implies that the massive land is lost to conservation.

Other recommendations:

In addition to the proposed strategies by the entire team, we suggest the following.

1. **Resettlement of the non-indigenous NCA communities.** The identification/updated list of non-indigenous NCA communities and subsequent return to their original places of origin should be done by involving the village governments and traditional leadership

systems. We propose that the exercise to identify and relocate immigrants is critical and should be achieved within the proposed short term period (2020-2023).

2. **Create a package for voluntary relocation.** The package may include:
 - i. Availability of a legally secured and arable land suitable for human settlement, cultivation and livestock production with social services (health, communication, education, security).
 - ii. Construction of decent houses in legally secured and titled lands.
 - iii. An attractive financial package for potential resettlers to decide where to decide by themselves.
3. **Enhancing education scheme for residents (particularly youth).** The ongoing effort to send more children to schools in various levels is a perfect strategy to send off people outside the NCA. Through education a significant number of residents have been employed, got married and/or are working and living outside NCA.

NAME	POSITION	SIGNATURE
Dr Kokel Melubo	Member Committee
Joseph Ngaire	Member Committee
William Oleseki	Member Committee
SHAYO ALAKARA	Member Committee