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**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMA</td>
<td>Associao do Meio Ambiente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APCD</td>
<td>Associação de Para legais de Cabo Delgado (Paralegal association Cabo Delgado)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFG</td>
<td>Community Forest Groups (agroforestry farming)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGCRN</td>
<td>Committee for Community Management of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COGEP</td>
<td>Participatory Natural Resource Management Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFE</td>
<td>Danish Forestry Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPCA</td>
<td>Direcção Provincial de Coordenação Ambiental (Provincial Directorate of Environmental Coordination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUAT</td>
<td>Direito de Uso e Aproveitamento de Terra (Right to use land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEFA</td>
<td>Forestry Extension to Farmers in Ancuabe district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographical Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITC</td>
<td>Iniciativa para Terras Comunitárias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDAE</td>
<td>Serviço Distrital das Actividades Económica (District services of economic activities, Agricultural department)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDPI</td>
<td>Serviços Distrital de Planeamento e Infra-estruturas (District services, planning and infrastructure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAFA</td>
<td>The Ancuabe Forestry Association Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDACA</td>
<td>Union district of associations and cooperatives, Ancuabe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPC</td>
<td>Provincial farmers union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPFFB</td>
<td>Serviço Provincial das Florestas Fauna Bravia (Provincial Forestry Wildlife Service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPGC</td>
<td>Serviços Provincias de Geografia e Cadastre (Cadastral Department at Province level)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

Objective of the Study
The purpose of this study is to summarize experiences, give recommendations and provide guidance in future advocacy work relating to securing community land rights in Mozambique. Ultimately, with the hope to enable communities to conduct advocacy on their own. The study is based on the experiences and lessons learned from the project, Forestry Extension for Farmers in Ancuabe (FEFA), a joint initiative of Associação do meio ambiente (ama), an NGO based in Cabo Delgado, Mozambique and the Danish NGO, Danish Forestry Extension (DFE). The project was implemented between 2006 and 2014.

The project’s primary focus was on creating forest user groups and promoting agroforestry systems in order to increase agricultural yields and decrease deforestation from shifting cultivation. However, as part of the project, ama also worked with the communities to safeguard their land rights. Ama has been engaged in the process of delimitation with three communities in Ancuabe district in the villages of Nacaca, Nanune, and Nacuei.

Interest in land has dramatically increased in Mozambique in recent years, as new investment activities in the areas of mineral extraction, timber, and agribusiness have been on the rise. Land rights issues have become more and more relevant among the target communities with whom DFE and ama work. This report documents the experiences of the work with the communities to secure their rights to land.

Study Area
The focal area is the district of Ancuabe, in the province of Cabo Delgado in northeastern Mozambique. Cabo Delgado has experienced record economic growth due to the extractive industry. Nonetheless, this economic growth has not been matched by poverty reduction and Cabo Delgado remains one of the least developed provinces in the country. The province has a population of around 1,650,000. It covers some 82,625 km², or twice the size of Denmark, with a 425 km coastline along the Indian Ocean. The provincial economy has so far been based on agriculture, mainly subsistence farming, with agriculture being by far the main contributor to the provincial GDP. Commercial forestry and tourism are other areas that are expanding and the recent economic development based on the extractive industry greatly increased after discoveries of gas, oil, graphite, gemstones, and minerals.

Within Cabo Delgado, the Ancuabe District covers 4,836 km² with a recorded population of 109,792 in 2005. Subsistence agriculture is the main source of livelihood for nearly the entire population. There is some commercial agriculture and cotton is one of the crops that has been making a comeback. The population uses the forest for firewood to meet their domestic energy needs. They also engage in charcoal production and sale, an enterprise that is putting increasing pressure on forest resources. The district is also home to several hardwood timber companies.

Other types of companies are in the tourism industry (Taratibu) and lately companies with investments in mineral extractions. The German company Graphite Kropfmuhl (GK) has reopened an old graphite mine in Ancuabe and is expected to expand their activities. At the time of this writing, there is surveying going on for new graphite mines in Ancuabe district. Gemstones such as rubies and red garnet have also been found and there have been continuous illegal mining activities surrounding these gemstones.

Thus, there are several areas in Ancuabe where the government and especially the extractive industry have demonstrated interests in gaining rights to land and other natural resources that the communities depend on. Ama has over the past several years built relationships with district directorates, community leaders as well as the community at large in Ancuabe. Through the FEFA project, legalized CSOs in the form of Committees for Community Management of Nature Resources (CGCRNs), the Participatory NRM Council (COGEP), Forest Growers Associations (FGAs), and the Ancuabe Forestry Associations Union (UAFA) have been formed to serve as local governance structures that are supposed to represent the communities.
Methodology

Document Review
Relevant papers, project documents, and official manuals were reviewed at the ama project office in Metoro, Ancuabe, Cabo Delgado. In addition, a number of reports and literature addressing land rights issues have also been reviewed and used to support some of the information found in the report.

Field Work
A Danish Forestry Extension forester was in the field in December 2013 and worked closely with ama staff to collect fieldwork data through individual interviews, group discussions, and meetings with selected stakeholders from the community, NGO, and government sectors. Following the field visit, DFE also contacted various professionals from organizations with experience in forestry or forestry investments in Mozambique.

While this report attempts to summarize information and findings from reports and stakeholder interviews as objectively as possible – statements or answers from interviews are not directly reproduced, and any conclusions or statements based on interviews must necessarily be viewed as interpretations made.

The following sectors were interviewed:

- Government representatives from the district and provincial level (6 interviews)
- Communities (4 villages, total of 50 participants)
- NGOs (ama and ITC)

Private forestry companies / institutional investors

All interviews were conducted as ‘semi-structured and qualitative’ in order to allow for an open dialogue. Interviews addressed technical, procedural, legal or political issues depending on the functions and role of the interviewee. Group interviews were held with community members from the four villages visited. During all meetings with community members and local district government officials, an ama staff served as translator.

2. Background

Context

Mozambique is rich in natural resources and local communities depend on access to nearby natural resources for their daily survival. As agriculture is the main livelihood activity, having access to land is crucial. In addition, the production of salable products from natural resources, such as charcoal, is often one of the most important sources of additional income for poor rural dwellers.

Recent discoveries of gas, oil, coal, gemstones, graphite, and other minerals have attracted foreign investment to Mozambique. The Government is having high expectations about the central role that the resources can play in reaching growth and reducing poverty in Mozambique. Especially industries such as mining, petroleum, logging of hard-wood timber, agri-business, and tourism are becoming increasingly interested in gaining access to rural communities’ most important economic asset – their land – that they use for subsistence farming, pastoral activities, fuel (charcoal), and construction material.

Thus, an ever increasing pressure on and exploitation of available natural resources by local communities, national interests and private investors is progressively evolving into conflicts, because better tracts of land are getting scarce and rights to land and legal ownership often remain vague (Tanner, 2005). The increased pressure on land has also contributed to changes in patterns towards a less sustainable use of natural resources among local communities. Activities such as clearing new land by uncontrolled bushfires destroy fauna and flora. The increased need for charcoal is causing the communities to cut down trees and bushes at an unsustainable rate.

The effects of those activities include erosion, loss of soil fertility, overgrazing, deforestation, vegetation changes, water pollution, rainfall changes, and floods with the effect of lower productivity. Furthermore, conflicts between humans and animals are more frequent since the communities are moving or are being moved closer to larger mammals’ natural habitats.

Local communities often have limited knowledge about the legal framework related to land and natural resources, or they are in a weak position to enforce their legal right. Lack of transparency may limit individuals and communities to make government officials and companies responsible for their actions or lack thereof. Private investors also face the risk of acquiring land and being surprised with traditional land use claims by local communities. These limitations are counterproductive for beneficial agreements between private investors, communities and the government.

There is an apparent need to build the local capacity in regards to legal rights to land, to strengthen dialogue, and level the playing field among communities, government, and private investors.
The Land Law

The State is obliged to respect, protect and fulfil human rights and fundamental freedoms. The Constitution of the Republic of Mozambique published on 22 of December 2004 contains a definition of the legal framework relating to land, and it establishes the following principles:

- Land in Mozambique is property of the State and it may not be sold, mortgaged, pledged or otherwise alienated;
- It is the right of all the people of Mozambique to use and enjoy the land as a means for the creation of wealth and social well-being; and
- The right to use and enjoy land is bestowed by the State and the State determines the conditions for such use.

Today, the Mozambican Land Law from 1997 and additional regulations and amendments are the basic framework governing rights to land, including customary land use by communities (hereinafter “the Land Law”). Mozambique has one of the most progressive land laws in Africa. It was among the first legislation in East Africa to expressly recognize and ensure customary rights (Tanner, 2005). However, the fundamental challenge is the actual enforcement and implementation of legislation.

Since all land in Mozambique is the property of the State, land cannot be bought or sold and one can only acquire the right to use land. This right to use the land is referred to as Direito de Uso e Aproveitamento de Terra, or DUAT. It is important to note that DUAT is used to refer to the right itself as well as the documentary proof of such a right. In the law, three ways of obtaining a DUAT are recognized (ACIS, 2000):

1. By customary norms and practices – local communities can obtain DUATs based on local customs and traditions, such as the inheritance of the land from their ancestors. Only citizens of Mozambique can claim customary land rights. (hereinafter referred to as ‘Type 1 DUAT’)
2. By good faith occupation – individuals, who have in good faith been using the land for at least 10 years. Only citizens of Mozambique can claim DUATs as a result of good faith occupation. (hereinafter referred to as ‘Type 2 DUAT’)
3. By submitting a formal application to the State according to the land legislation. This is the only way to obtain a DUAT for foreign individuals or companies. (hereinafter referred to as ‘Type 3 DUAT’)

The difference between a Type 3 DUAT and a Type 1 and 2 DUAT is that one is applying to obtain a title deed and an approval of a right that does not yet exists, while Type 1 and 2 DUATs already exist and are legally protected, even without an actual title deed. An individual or community can request a formal recognition of a Type 1 or 2 DUAT by obtaining a title deed.

A formal Type 3 DUAT application, as a company may submit to the State in order to conduct economic activity, is valid for up to 50 years, and can be renewed for an equal period. When applying for a Type 3 DUAT in order to conduct a specific economic activity, relevant complementary licenses (tourism, industrial, etc.) must also be obtained and economic undertakings must be preceded by an environmental impact assessment (EIA) and consultation process where community members are involved.

In the case of customary land rights and land rights by good faith occupation, a Type 1 and 2 DUAT may be deemed to exist without actually being documented. The local communities have, by law, the right to use the land whenever they have occupied a tract of land for longer than 10 years. In many cases, these communities do not have documentary proof of this right. Thus, the rural communities who have customary land rights may be vulnerable to loss or reduction of their land. They can be left in a weak position to negotiate or withhold any new land use rights, should land be found favorable by government or external investors.
Any starting point of negotiation is difficult when there is no proof about the exact position, size or borders of community land. If a DUAT cannot be ‘produced’, then the community does not have a good position to negotiate with outsiders who are interested in their land.

One of the best options the rural communities have is to identify the geographic boundaries of the land area they occupy through a delimitation process. This will help them prove their rights to that land, mitigate land disputes, as well as avoid missing missing government revenue sharing schemes.

The delimitation process results in a Certidão de Delimitação (Certificate of Delimitation). It serves as proof for the communities’ customary land right and establishes the geographic boundaries of this right. However, it does not exclude the possibility of external investors obtaining a Type 3 DUAT inside the community land. What the certificate does provide is a far better position for negotiating terms of compensation or access to government revenue sharing schemes.

While the Mozambican State guarantees access to land, both for Mozambicans and for foreign citizens, the recognition and protection of customary rights and the simultaneous encouragement of private investment, currently is and will continuously be a significant challenge to handle by government officials.

Demarcation or Delimitation?

The notions of demarcation and delimitation are often interchangeably used when referring to Type 1 DUAT, but misinterpretations hereof are common. From a technical perspective, demarcation involves placement of concrete markers, often using high precision GPS devices, whereas delimitation does not require any physical markers in the field and cheap handheld GPS devices with precision error within 20 meters will suffice. Demarcation is mostly applied in urban development or other large investments in infrastructure. In addition, any person who has submitted an application for a Type 3 DUAT and received provisional authorization has to within one year demarcate the area of land for which the DUAT is sought.

Thus, demarcation is obligatory in order to be able to obtain a Type 3 DUAT and a definite title deed, while delimitation serves to prove Type 1 and 2 DUATS in order to be able to resolve conflicts or forge partnerships. Delimitation is sufficient for a community when their goal is to obtain a certificate of the geographic boundaries, but not for the issuance of a title deed.

3. Delimitation of Land

This section explains the actual technical process of delimitation. Overall, while the process is straightforward, the bureaucratic hurdles are significant. It took ama more than four years to secure the first certificate of delimitation for a member community. Thus there are significant challenges in implementing the process and the government lacks financial and human resources to offer delimitation services to the communities. According to a report from Focus on land in Africa, only 258 communities and roughly 18% of rural land have so far been delimited in Mozambique. And nearly all of those delimitations have been led by NGOs and donors.

In the case of Cabo Delgado, ama has been one of the few and first NGOs that has assisted in the community delimitation process and one of the first NGOs to succeed in getting a certificate. Another organization engaged in community delimitation in Cabo Delgado is The Community Land initiative (iTC), in collaboration with the NGO Centro Terra Viva, who was hired to do the actual fieldwork.

The process of obtaining a certificate on delimitation is described in a government manual, Manual de Delimitacao De Terras Das Comunidades, from 2000, published by the Food and Agriculture Organization in collaboration with the local government. The manual is in Portuguese only. A 2nd edition has been published.

---

3 See explanation of government sharing scheme in Section 4 in report.
in 2008. There appear to be no differences between the two publications. The manual contains chapters on the political context, the legal framework, concepts of delimitation, the technical undertaking of delimitation, mobilization of communities and various registration forms.

The manual seems accepted as the official guidelines for undertaking delimitation of community land. Ama has used the manual when working with the communities on the delimitation process. At the Serviços Provincias de Geografia e Cadastre (SPGC), the Provincial Geography and Cadaster Department, the staff was familiar with this manual and the approach.

Below is the outline of the process that ama has followed when leading a land delimitation with the communities.

**Steps in the Delimitation Process**
The steps outlined below should be seen as mandatory. However, the manner in which meetings are prepared and conducted seems to vary a great deal in practice. Moreover, the practical approach to this process has been described with some ambiguity as iTC, ama and government officials are not describing the details of the process in the same way.

1. **Community mobilization**
   - Call of interest
     *For the SPGC to become involved in delimitation there needs to be a call of interest from the community.*
   - Information meeting
     *Government staff or NGO workers explain villagers the laws, rights and national policy. This step ends with the election of a representative board at the village level. They sign the Form 1 in the manual.*
     i. Bordering villages should be consulted and represented at the meeting.
     ii. Participatory draft maps
     *Paper and pencil maps are drawn prior to the actual fieldwork to ensure a preliminary overview of community land and to resolve possible conflicts or doubts on land.*
     iii. Participatory rural assessment
     *This includes a historical profile with a timeline, social organization, participatory maps, current use of natural resources, population dynamics, current conflicts, etc.*
     iv. Election of village representatives to assist in the mapping fieldwork
     *A number of people are selected from the villages to ensure participation of 2-3 people from each village during the fieldwork. The village representatives accompany a GIS technician that collects waypoints."

2. **Fieldwork**
   - Sampling of GPS waypoints of the community borders.

3. **Community meeting**
   - Presentation of draft map including the GPS waypoints.
   - Confirmation with neighbors.
   - Map review if necessary.

4. **Milestone: Final draft map**
5. Papers are temporarily handed over to the district for approval
   - The district administrator and director of the agricultural department verify the process.
   - The district administrator signs off and returns the paperwork to the community - and the community sends documents to the SPGC.

6. Application with SPGC for approval and certification of the map
   - Consultation with technicians and verification of the process.
   - The Director issues a certificate and submits the papers to the National Level Government (DINAGECA). Thereafter, it becomes an official map.

7. Milestone: Certificate of Delimitation is issued to the community

(AMA, 2013; FAO 2000)

The delimitation process involves staff from the SPGC, the district administration, the community being delimited and its neighbors, plus NGO staff supporting the process, in this case ama. According to ama staff, only five delimitation technicians could be found in the whole province in 2013. This implies a long delay given the current demand for delimitation and demarcation.

There is also a private consultant office, the GEOCET, which provides the same services as the SPGC. Incidentally, there is a kind of revolving door situation between the SPGC and the GEOCET and the same technicians can be found in both places. It is quite likely that the process will move faster if GEOCET services are requested, but it also means that a higher consultant fee has to be paid. Obtaining a certificate requires that the delimitation be conducted in collaboration with an external consultant who is a certified ‘land use planner’ found among the technicians at SPGC or GEOCET. This setup clearly represents a conflict of interest for those consultants working simultaneously for the government and a private company.

District government annual budgets do not include costs for conducting delimitation activities. These expenses are seen to occur at the provincial level with the SPGC. Thus while companies or individuals must pay for delimitation or demarcation services, SPGC are supposed to deliver community delimitation as part of their public service. In reality, however, NGOs are financing these inputs whether they are done by GEOCET or SPGC. In the case of ama, the GIS technicians used for delimitation activities were acquired through the SPGC. ITC, on the other hand, said that they have hired GEOCET consultants to do community delimitation.

4. The Land Law and Rights over Natural Resources
The delimitation process described above is an important tool to establish strong rights over community land. Given the current context in Cabo Delgado, the delimitation process can be seen as an essential mechanism to 1) successfully implement the 20% revenue sharing scheme under the forest exploitation regime and 2) to level the playing field for investment partnerships between communities and the private sector.

Community Land and Forest Resources
Just as land is property of the state, forests resources are also owned by the state and the Forestry and Wildlife Law establishes the legal framework for forest resources use and management. Unlike the land law, which recognizes inherent community land rights, the forestry law does no such thing, except in a limited way, i.e. that individuals have the right to subsistence level use. Local communities thus have the right to use forest resources to meet their daily needs and they can also designate forest areas of cultural significance.
All other forest exploitation requires approval from the state and there are two types of licenses available. Simple Licenses can be only obtained by national operators or communities, who want to use forest for commercial, industrial or fuel-producing purposes, such as charcoal. The simple license limits quotas to 500 cubic meters or less over five years. In Cabo Delgado there were 65 simple license holders in 2008 (Wit & Norfolk, 2010). The other type of license is a concession contract, which is available for individuals, corporations, both national and non-national, and communities. These concession contracts require a prior community consultation and a management plan and apply to areas larger than 20,000 hectares. They are given for a period of 50 years, with 5-year renewals. There were about 31 concession contracts in Cabo Delgado in 2008 (Wit & Norfolk, 2010).

The way communities are supposed to benefit from the Forest & Wildlife Law is that it ensures communities a share of the tax revenue the government collects from the concession of natural resources. This includes fees collected from simple licenses, concession contracts, hunting, commercial production of charcoal, and harvesting of bamboo, among others (ACIS, 2012). The communities are entitled to a 20% share of this government revenue (hereafter ’20% revenue sharing scheme’). In addition, they are entitled to 50% of the value of fines paid for forest law violations.

However, in reality there are many irregularities and shortcomings with the implementation of the Forestry and Wildlife Law and its related regulations and annexes. Firstly, large quantities of timber are annually harvested unlicensed and illegally and forests are being degraded at an alarming rate. According to a recent report by the Environmental Investigation Agency (EIA), 48% of China’s total imports from Mozambique in 2012 were not licensed or registered for export by the authorities in Mozambique (EIA, 2013). This is an estimated tax revenue loss of $29 million in 2012 (ibid.). According to a government report, clandestine timber production is estimated to be around 50 – 70% in Mozambique (Del Gatto, 2003).

Apart from timber production, both legal and illegal, the other problem is illegal charcoal production, which many of the community members ama works with are engaged in. The community members can produce charcoal non-commercially for their own consumption without having to obtain a license. However, if they are selling the charcoal outside of their village, which many of them do, then a license is required. According to the same government report, only 1 – 5% of the total charcoal production is currently registered (ibid).

In ama’s experience, the de facto practice is that local community producers do not have a license and do not pay any fees. The main reason is that they cannot obtain a license at their local government office but have to travel a great distance and deal with unfamiliar paperwork and government procedures. It is middlemen or charcoal traders that transport larger charcoal quantities by road who obtain a license and pay the fees to the government. In addition, there are also unwritten rules where the authorities have instructed their patrolling officers to let people transport up to four bags of 50 kg per car/day, traveling from the rural to the urban areas, without having to have a license. Thus, a major part of the charcoal production system operates outside the legal framework and breaks the Forestry and Wildlife Law.

The reality then is that the communities are entitled to the 20% revenue sharing scheme from for example licensed timber production on community land. However, at the same time, those communities are themselves engaging in unlicensed, commercial charcoal production and should technically have a license and be paying fees to the government.

The provincial government is responsible for channeling back 20% of the revenue from sale of forest products to the communities where the timber and charcoal was harvested. The revenue must be returned to the ‘origin’ the following year. Following the observations by ama staff, the funds from charcoal are
normally channeled through the district administration from the province, as the origin of the charcoal production cannot be traced all the way back to the village. It has not been possible to verify the scale at which revenue sharing actually occurs. It is likely that the main funds never reach back to the rural communities.

**Community Land and Private Investment**

In the areas where ama works, there are currently no known partnerships in forestry, agriculture, or mining between private companies and communities. Other than forestry and agriculture, there is one company GK Graphite – a mining company with a mineral concession, that has re-opened and been operating for the last two years. The company is supporting the communities with school construction, health facilities, carpentry training, and local jobs. Another mining company, Montepuez Ruby Mining Lda. has received a license for ruby mining. However, in the villages where ama works, mining activities are not regulated and illegal mining is flourishing.

Timber concessions are according to the laws entered between the SPGC and the investor. This leaves local communities to trust that part of the revenue will eventually be channeled back to them by the SPGC, a process that so far has not worked well. In some cases, timber cutters make a deal with the local leadership of a village, who let the trees be cut in exchange for small tokens such as bicycles, cell phones, or some money. Even when a local natural resource management committee (CGCRN) exists, in some cases the leadership of the village makes deals with outsiders for their own benefit.

Illegal logging is widespread and it regularly leads to conflicts between communities and outside operators. Ama has assisted several villages in reporting timber operators who were logging without a license, logging outside their assigned area, logging the wrong tree species, or logging during periods where it is prohibited to cut trees. One of the cases in the Campine village, where a timber operator was cutting timber outside his licensed area, went to the national level. The timber was confiscated and the operator had to pay penalties. Generally, the government does not have the capacity to regulate the prevalent illegal logging activities.

Some of the companies that are known to operate with forestry and plantation investments in Mozambique are:

- ALCEDA
- CHIKWETI
- Green resources

According to two of these companies, the investment in new land for plantations is usually initiated at the ministerial level. Here the investor can get a ‘pre-approval’ of the investment proposal. Following this pre-approval and backed by a ministerial ‘thumbs-up’, the investors now turn the process bottom-up, initiating a consultation with the local communities.

Community consultation is part of the legal procedure and the community has to agree with the investment proposal and make the land available for the investor. If the community consultation proceeds successfully, minutes can be signed by the community, the investor and the local government and forwarded to the district administrator who signs and forwards the documents to the governor of the province for approval. Once approved, the investor will be issued a DUAT. The next step then is to obtain a forestry license, which must include an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and forest management plan.

Investors view the time span of forestry as a challenge when working with communities as they (communities) tend to have a short outlook. The legal procedures and collaboration with governments can also be tedious, but the biggest challenge remain to maintain a long-term working partnership with
communities. Forest managers have expressed that communication and patience is important skills when working with communities and see themselves investing substantial time in meetings.

Whenever investment activities are initiated, it will be beneficial for communities to have certificates of delimitation and to know about the rights of demanding community consultations.

5. Summary of Experiences

In the project period, ama managed to test the delimitation process with three villages. In ama’s experience, the process was very bureaucratic and tedious and required persistent involvement and follow-up with government authorities. The first certificate was obtained in December 2013, where a visit to the SPGC by the DFE forester and ama staff prompted the director to produce and sign a certificate of delimitation for the Nanune village that was dated back to 2011, when ama and the community members first started the process. The whole process from engaging in delimitation to obtaining the three certificates took about four years.

The other two villages to obtain certificates of delimitations are Nacuei and Nacaca, both in March 2014. Approximately USD 30,000 of NGO project money was used to certify the three villages. The costs covered mobilization and information dissemination in delimitation and neighboring villages, meetings with local authorities, paying for government technicians, demarcation exercise, forest inventory, devolution of draft maps, taxes, among others. These costs do not include transport, fuel, communication, or accommodation costs for ama staff. This shows that it is very hard for a community to initiate a certification process because of the high cost. Both NGOs and government officials see it as unlikely that communities will initiate the delimitation process on their own.

Village Groups Discussions

In three of the four group discussions with village communities, there was a positive attitude towards clarifying land use rights and delimiting community land. Maps are especially viewed as a helpful tool to document village land and to avoid land disputes with neighboring villages. Communities are aware that maps offer the possibility to distinguish borders between neighboring villages and serve as documentation of land ownership.

The concept of land use rights is generally well understood in principle, but understanding how land use rights serve to support communities and can be applied in practice is generally not so well understood by
the community members interviewed. While communities want to believe in the mapping process, there is, at the same time, a disbelief that the legal right to land will actually be enforced fully under the present socio-economic conditions.

**Nanune**

Nanune is a remote village and the first one to go through the delimitation exercise with ama. The area is rich in timber resources and a Chinese timber company, Mofid\(^4\), was operating there. In addition, the area experienced a lot of illegal logging. There was no government regulation or patrolling and the community was not well organized to protect their resources. Ama established a CGCRN and disseminated information about the land, wildlife, and environmental law. Ama also did a forest inventory with the community in order to stress the forestry potential and the need to have control over their timber resources and to manage them responsibly. A Land Use Plan was also developed with the community but before they started to implement the plan, ruby was discovered. The village area falls under the Montepuez Ruby Mining license. The reality today is that community members mostly are involved in illegal mining activities; the area is flooded with foreigners interested in finding minerals. The local NRM groups are difficult to organize and motivate to work together on regulating and protecting local resources for positive community development. The main interest in the community is the search for valuable gemstones.

Nanune is an example of a poor rural community with very limited access to resources and alternative livelihoods. It is understandable that their first priority is to make ends meet and that they are attracted by such an opportunity presented by the prospect of finding valuable gemstones. This experience shows that it is not enough to support communities to learn about and claim their legal rights but that there is also a need for alternative livelihood creation and a certain standard of well-being before such activities as illegal gemstone mining become unattractive. It also shows the importance of government involvement as it is the government who should be the ones setting up the framework for regulating the mining activities.

**Nacuei**

Nacuei is a centrally located village that is close to the main road and urban areas and sale of charcoal is a major source of income for many. Many villagers from outside come to the Nacuei area to harvest wood for charcoal production and the present production is not sustainable. It is the main cause for a shrinking forest in this area. Apart from engaging in the delimitation process, the project worked with charcoal producers and trials on a rotational forest-harvesting scheme with improved kilns. Ama also established a five hectare protected forest area as well as bee keeping operations as an alternative livelihood option for the charcoal producers.

When asked, the charcoal producers mentioned better access to the market as very important to them, as they remain in a weak market position relative to the middlemen and other charcoal traders. The charcoal producers of Nacuei and the surrounding villages are selling charcoal off the road (i.e. commercial production). This charcoal is largely made from high value timber species. Commercial charcoal production requires a license and paying of fees to the government and making charcoal from high value timber species is ‘de jure’ illegal. However, licenses for charcoal production are rarely (if ever) obtained by local charcoal producers in the villages.

The scenario is that the community is engaged in unlicensed charcoal production and this is not a good position from which to begin to report illegal activities by middlemen or demand the 20% revenue sharing scheme. However, the delimitation certificate gives power to Nacuei to manage their resources and protect

---

\(^4\) According to EIA, Mofid has been involved in illegal timber trade: [http://eia-international.org/mozambique-timber-probe-a-test-of-ability-to-enforce-law](http://eia-international.org/mozambique-timber-probe-a-test-of-ability-to-enforce-law).
them against outsiders who come to harvest trees for commercial charcoal production. The surrounding villages know that Nacuei has defined boundaries that are managed by the Nacuei villagers.

**Natocua**

While engaging in the delimitation exercise with Nacuei, an issue arose with the neighboring village of Natocua. Natocua subsequently opposed the delimitation process, seeing the outcome as unfair, too fast paced and convinced that the neighboring village of Nacuei had stolen part of their traditional land. According to AMA staff, the process has been conducted following standard procedure, with all neighboring villages participating during the process. Minutes with signatures support this view. This example shows that land disputes can arise between communities during the delimitation process. Land disputes are almost bound to occur at some point. The question is how they are solved once they occur. Apart from the actual land dispute between the two villages, Natocua expressed a general distrust in their neighbors in Nacuei.

The chairman of the village was not present during the group discussion, and it was mentioned that the chairman had vested interests with a private company working with minerals and construction. It was reported that crops on several occasions had been damaged without the chairman confronting the company. This example illustrates that communities are only as strong as their chairmen or traditional leaders. Large companies may easily ‘buy’ their way in poor rural communities.

**Nacaca**

The village of Nacaca has recently experienced a mineral bonanza, with findings of rubies and red garnet. During the group discussion, even the chairman could display a small plastic bag full of rubies. For some – especially those who are physical fit - it is the big chance to make fast money through illegal mining. The mineral business therefore especially attracts the workforce of younger men. The lucky ones find a ruby and earn enough money to purchase motorbikes or even a car. Money is usually spent as fast as it is earned.

The district administration is aware of the situation and said that the government: “is pleased to see the wealth that follows from the discovery of minerals– but also worried about the development and monitor the situation closely.”

The situation with the mineral discovery demonstrates the government’s and also the community’s inability to handle a situation where the chance for fast money suddenly occurs. The chaotic and completely uncontrolled mineral mining in Nacaca is an example where something that should be an income opportunity for both the state and the community ends up benefitting ‘the able and opportunistic’ only, with anonymous middlemen probably earning the lions share. This situation could be imagined in the case of a local community in possession of valuable timber. They would be the ones not benefitting from the timber extraction without external assistance or a very sound investor.

Strong local government that enforce legislation and a community that generally accepts to abide by government guidelines seems a necessity when large ‘values’ are discovered on collectively owned land.

The chairman of the village explicitly asked for assistance to write letters to district and provincial government when they needed to report an illegal timber harvest or request for funds from the 20% revenue sharing scheme. It was suggested that access to a community bank account would be very helpful, as district officials seemed reluctant to carry money in cash, all the way to their distant village.

**Salauue**

Salauue is a village where delimitation and application for a certificate was undertaken by iTC. The chairman and several other village members expressed that the process had been completed very fast, except that
they had not yet received a certificate and had not heard anything for a long time now (1½ years). The village requested AMA to follow up on this issue.

The topics discussed were quite similar to what had been mentioned in the other villages concerning delimitation and land use rights. Better access to the 20% revenue sharing scheme was also mentioned. But the experience reflects the experiences of ama, where the government stalls the processing of delimitation certificates and the communities have to wait a long time to receive certificates.

Overall, the group discussion with the village communities revealed some challenging situations. They show that delimitation of land of one community can cause conflict with a neighboring community and NGOs have to be aware of the effects their work can have on the surrounding communities that are excluded from the process. In addition, the scenarios with the community’s commercial charcoal production and unregulated mining and logging illustrate the low capacity of government to implement the legal frameworks in place and make them work for both the community and the government. In addition, the lucrative short-term profits these illegal activities bring can entice community members to pursue their individual interest and neglect what is a long-term benefit for the community.

Local Institutional Frameworks
The above outlined examples support the notion that there is a great need in Mozambique to establish capacitated institutions that will support the rural communities in managing their land and other natural resources and make the laws on paper work in practice. Just as with the Land Law, Mozambique has a well laid out policy framework for devolution of power to the communities over their natural resources. The Land and Forestry legislation calls for the establishment of local level institutions, namely the village level Comite de Gestao Comunitario de Recursos Naturais or Committee for Community Management of Natural Resources (CGCRN), responsible for NR management, monitoring illegal activities related to NR (e.g. logging), negotiation with private sector, and holding and distribution for the 20% revenue sharing scheme from the government. Above the CGCRN is the district level organization Comite de Gestao Participativa de Recursos Florestais e Faunisticos or Participatory NRM Council (COGEP), which is an umbrella organization serving as a forum for the local communities, the private sector, associations, and the state. The councils are created in each district and their main goal is to reconcile the various actors’ interests regarding the use and exploitations of natural resources.

Just as the process of delimitation is supported by NGOs, it takes NGOs to push for the establishment of CGCRNs and COGEPs in practice. In the Ancuabe district, ama supported the administrative and legalization process to establish 14 village level committees, CGCRNs, and the Ancuabe District COGEP. Ama also provided capacity training in Roles and Responsibility of Members, Leadership and Conflict Management, Community Patrolling, Participatory Forest Management, etc.

Committee for Community Management of Natural Resources (CGCRN)
CGCRNs are central in relation to land use rights and its members are expected to participate in education, outreach campaigns, sector legislation and to promote sound practices for sustainable use and management of natural resources towards development (social, economic and cultural). The committees’ role is also to defend the rights and benefits of communities in the exploitation of resources by operators and forestry companies.

The responsibilities of CGCRN members are without doubt large. What many of the villages in Ancuabe are exposed to is illegal logging. Monitoring and patrolling the community for illegal activity is not without risk. In contrast, the only payment is the access to sitting allowances during meetings with NGOs and various committees. In all villages visited, it is the impression that CGCRN members are proud to be part of this committee. Irrespective of the efficiency of the CGCRNs ability to monitor village land – it is obvious that
members are insecure on how to process reports on illegal activities. Contrasting answers were given concerning measures towards ‘outsiders’ doing illegal harvest of timber or charcoal. Procedures on how to deal with illegal activities have not been formalized or discussed in detail in any villages. Vague answers are also given when discussing how to respond to inquiries from ‘would be’ investors.

Participatory Natural Resource Management Council (COGEP)

The COGEP in Ancuabe District is located in Metoro. It was established in May 2012 and legalized in November 2012. There are 12 people on the Board and there are about 70 members, from local villages, NGOs and associations concerned with environmental issues. The COGEP is the link between the local committees and the government and are supposed to communicate the communities concerns to the government and also to communicate back to the communities on what they have learned from the government. Meetings are held quarterly with a general assembly held once a year.

The overall purpose of a COGEP is to improve socio-economic circumstances for member communities/villages. More specifically, the COGEP is assisting on the following issues (COGEP 2013):

- Supporting applications for exploitation of forest and wildlife resources to contribute to raising the living standards of local community members.
- Monitoring and collaboration with state agencies responsible for enforcement of forest and wildlife resources.
- Improvement of policies and legislation on forest and wildlife resources and guidelines of management plans of natural resources.
- Resolving disputes with involved stakeholders concerning use and exploitation of forest and wildlife.

COGEP is most likely one of the best possible venues to share information on progress concerning community land rights. The sheer size of the group may make it difficult to actually decide and act on various tasks. Thus, it is not believed to be the place to expect any direct action; rather, it can be the place to share information on any irregularities according to the legal framework and to seek strength in numbers in a common forum. However, one challenge with the COGEP is the travel aspect for the CGCRN representatives. Some of the villages are very remote and communities do not have easy means of transporting themselves, so it often very difficult or impossible for the individual local members to meet up for district level meetings.

Community Forest User Groups and District Forest Grower’s Associations (UAFA)

The FEFA project supported the establishment of 14 forest user groups and two associated representative district level forest grower associations in Ancuabe and Montepuez. These groups were mainly focused on implementing agroforestry methods to increase corn yields and on participatory natural resource and forest management. The district associations are the ones who provide extension services, marketing and procurement services and legal advice at district level for all the groups working with forest related commercial activities. These groups have established democratic institutional structures and they will play an important part in future activities regarding land rights along with the CGCRNs and COGEP, especially when it comes to focusing on livelihood creation through better agricultural and forest use practices, which is a crucial aspect in the land rights puzzle.

Government Institutions

Apart from the local level CGCRN and COGEP, there are several local and provincial government institutions involved in the areas of land rights and natural resource management. Ama has established working relationships with them and it will be important to cooperate with them in future work on land rights.
District Administration (DA)
The specific role of the district administration in delimitation of village land is to sign off the final application of land delimitation. In addition, the DA staff is supposed to spot-check with the communities to ensure that the delimitation process has been conducted properly. This leaves the process of delimitation with some ambiguity concerning active involvement of the district, since district involvement requires funds currently not allocated in the annual work budgets. Since the DA staff has no budget allocated for spot-checking, this can delay the approval process for delimited land.

The DA view its participation in delimitation of community land as important and they wish to be informed about ongoing delimitation projects. They also wish to be a part of sensitization and mobilization of communities in relation to delimitation and land use planning; however, resources remain limited and unallocated. According to the district permanent secretary the district will willingly assist in the delimitation process if capacity and resources are available, noting that delimitation and mapping might reduce disputes between neighboring villages.

District services of economic activities, Agricultural department (SDAE)
The agricultural department is responsible for agricultural extension within the district. They monitor and enforce land laws in the district and undertake mediation and conflict resolution related to the exploitation of natural resources. They also work to support community initiatives for sustainable management.

Most importantly, SDAE is responsible for channeling to the communities their share from the 20% revenue sharing scheme, which they receive from the Provincial Forestry Wildlife Service (SPFFB). When directly asked, SDAE admits that revenue sharing is difficult and slow due to the difficulties in transferring funds to the communities. The obstacles are travel distance, lack of bank accounts and the need to travel with cash.

In collaboration with the district administration, SDAE also take part in the legitimation of delimitation of community land. It is seen as important that SDAE review and sign off (with the district administration) to conclude the initial steps of the certification process before applying to the Provincial Cadastral Department (SPGC).

Provincial Cadastral and Department (SPGC)
The SPGC in Cabo Delgado oversees 16 districts. As the responsible entity with the technical expertise in GIS mapping, this department has significant influence on the delimitation process and the final outcome. The department has the legitimacy to issue DUATs. The technical staff has to ensure the delimitation process has been conducted properly. Following approval, the director can issue a certificate.

Thus, it is in principle the SPGC that is expected to deliver a range of public services, including delimitation and mapping services to communities. The reality, however, is that the budget of the SPGC is already stretched and apparently does not allow for a timely fulfillment of all activities. As the services of the SPGC are in high demand by private investors that need DUATs and since private investors are paying for paperwork and maps, the department maximizes its revenues by giving more attention to such tasks. This likely leads to the postponement of services that should be delivered as part of government funds to the communities, who cannot and should not pay for SPGC services.

Due to the authority vested with SPGC, this government institution remains a key stakeholder in the land rights issue.

Provincial Forestry Wildlife Service (SPFFB)
The SPFFB enforce the Law on Forestry and wildlife and are responsible for monitoring forest resources and trade with timber and charcoal. This department issues fines on illegal logging and they also issue timber and charcoal trade licenses. The SPFFB depends on the cooperation of district authorities and local
communities to monitor forest resources and trade. Especially CGCRNs are used as informers on illegal activities.

SPFFB is not important in relation to delimitation and DUATs as such, but their role in forest management and the administration of the 20% revenue sharing scheme on timber etc., is important in relation to securing tangible cash benefits at the community level. Thus, the process on timber trade and revenue sharing deserves to be fully explored in practice through close collaboration with the SPFFB.

Other Important Stakeholders
In future land rights advocacy work, ama needs to cooperate closely with other associations and non-government organizations, some of which are shortly introduced below.

Union district of associations and cooperatives, Ancuabe (UNDACA)
UDACA is an umbrella organization that represent farmers and farmer’s organizations to ensure social, economic and cultural rights. UDACA is working with creation and legalization of associations and cooperatives, dissemination and training on land laws.

UDACA is also supporting to organize and unite demand to defend peasants rights (Land tenure, social, economic and cultural). They work to ensure food sovereignty, taking into account gender equity and work with farmers to generate wealth through sustainable land use (production and sale of food). The organization could be an important co-player in enforcing and advocating land use rights.

Provincial farmers union (UPC)
The UPC is active in the formulation of public policies and development of strategies that represent farmers and their organizations to ensure their social and economic rights.

As UDACA, the union could be an important co-player in enforcing land use rights and promoting advocacy.

Associação de Para legais de Cabo Delgado (APCD)
Provide paralegal advice to rural communities and the private sector to mediate and negotiate in relation to land disputes. They are a very relevant future partner on the land rights issue.

Iniciativa para terras comunitarias (ITC)
ITC is an independent fund, established in 2007 in order to improve the implementation of the 1997 Land Law. It is working in 8 of Mozambique’s ten provinces, namely in Gaza, Tete, Cabo Delgado, Niassa, Zambezia, Nampula, Sofala, and Manica. iTC provides financial and technical support to communities wishing to secure their land and natural resources rights in connection with promotion of economic development.

ITC is a fund that hires qualified service providers, i.e. NGOs, private firms, lawyers and surveyors. In Cabo Delgado they have supported land delimitation and they are an important player that ama should coordinate with in the future.

Centro Terra Viva and Forum Terra
Two NGO that practice monitoring and advocacy in the area of Good Environmental Governance and provide legal advice in relation to DUATs, empowerment of rural communities on environmental legislation and conservation of natural resources, support to participation of civil society including community initiatives in environmental protection and natural resource management. They are very important partners for ama in its future work with land rights.
6. Recommendations

Based on the experiences presented above, the following are the main recommendations for future work on land rights:

Strengthening Local Institutions

- **Make ID cards for CGCRN members**
  
  SPFFB should provide every member of the CGCRNs with an ID card. This will increase morale and equip any patrolling CGCRN member with more authority should he need to confront someone.

- **Equip CGCRNs with bank accounts**
  
  Both government officials and community members interviewed have asked for means to transfer government funds from the revenue sharing scheme to communities. In order for a community to be able to receive its 20%, it must first be represented by a CGCRN, which must be registered with the DA and which must have a bank account (ACIS 2012).

- **Participatory development and implementation of village bylaws**
  
  Community members remain insecure about how to handle irregularities such as illegal logging. Locally accepted village bylaws could serve to fill the gaps in national legislation and define responsibility and actions within the community.

In the management of collectively owned goods (such as community land) democratic institutions must provide the backbone against which actions and decisions are made. Having stronger organizations could also shift focus from an individual NGO staff or community members and thus remove elements of personal risk that inherently is related to management and law enforcement of natural resources and land use rights.

The existing institutions found in northern Mozambique, the CGCRNs and COGEPs are a good start but need further capacity building and strengthening. They need procedures that ensure transparency and accountability.

At present there is not a uniform way, in which illegal issues are reported. Communities have their own ways, which in most cases are only as strong as the village chairman. Villages should also agree on village bylaws, which outline how village land is managed, how illegal incidents are reported (and by whom), etc. These village bylaws could be part of the foundation against which CGCRNs and COGEP are working. In addition to the village bylaws, it follows that other tools are needed as suggested in some villages, including:

- Procedures
- Village bylaws
- ID cards
- Bank account

External NGOs or government staff can play an important role in shaping the structures and tools that could support accountability and transparency, but content should be left for the villages to decide. In this context, village bylaws are believed a key element to the evolution of democratic structures that have the capacity to manage land.

Co-management and support through COGEP will provide individual villages a stronger institutional setup, increasing political power and removing focus from single villages. The downside is that the sheer member size of COGEP and versatile interests in this forum can quickly become time consuming and inefficient if not
properly managed. Furthermore, the problems of travel for the local CGCRN members can prohibit village representatives from participation. Still, COGEP is found one of the best forums to represent villages in relation to land ‘ownership’ and ‘management' issues.

Future Advocacy Work

- AMA to create communication channels to inform as frequent and broadly as possible.
  AMA needs to develop stronger channels of communicating challenges and achievements. Working with advocacy and securing land rights will require better communication, broader networking and more attention from local media.

- Continue building capacity of local and government institutions
  With the technical part in place and an organizational foundation established through CGCRNs and COGEP, the next thing needed is to promote a conducive environment – through advocacy - that will serve to empower communities on land use rights. First of all, advocacy requires strong communication skills. There are already multiple organizations working with land use rights and legal issues in Cabo Delgado. The current information flow between these organizations is at best ad hoc. It seems meetings are the most common venue of information exchange. While meetings of face-to-face may be effective, they are also time consuming and expensive. Limiting the information flow to mainly meetings will create a bottleneck. A more frequent information flow is likely to create increased interest and more awareness – in the end making advocacy easier.

While many rural villagers do not own a cell phone nor have access to the internet, AMA must positively consider the use of social media on the internet like twitter, facebook and similar. These means of communication seems obvious as they are cheap and come with the potential to provide frequent information and communication to higher government officials, newspapers and local radio, staff in other NGOs and key organizations. Ama can also use its own website to inform about their work on land rights.

AMA has gained solid skills in the administrative and technical part of securing certificates of delimitation. However, this is only the first step. Securing legal compliance and benefits from land rights is the next challenge.

AMA needs to continue to work with the communities and the existing institutional structures to build their capacity relating to securing, managing, and advocating for the land rights interest of the rural communities. Further, cooperation with the relevant government institutions need to be maintained and government officials should also benefit from receiving capacity development in the areas of land rights. In addition, government should be made aware of their role as duty bearers and lobbied to be a strong supporter of community rights.

The urgent need for securing community land rights

Mozambique is a prime example of a country where legal frameworks that recognize community land rights and customary tenure exist. There is also the recognition in law of local institutions to secure these rights. Nonetheless, the experiences of this project show that a lot of work needs to be done before these frameworks are implemented properly and before the institutional structures have enough capacity to be able to represent community rights and interests. There is an urgent need for improved governance on the local, provincial, and national level, including democratic self-governance inside village communities.

Adding to this urgent need is today’s global context, where the natural resources found in Mozambique, from gas, to oil, coal, arable land, and minerals, are highly coveted. Unless supported, the local rural communities will lose their fight to claim their right to the land that is the basis of their survival. The government, NGOs, private companies and communities will have to find a path of cooperation in order to
prevent rising conflicts. Managing the growing demand for Mozambique’s land and resources in a globalized economy requires deliberate action that focuses on equitable access to these resources.

DFE and ama are continuing their work on land rights and a new project, Just Environmental Governance – expanding community rights to use and benefit from natural resources, is set to address the recommendations given in this report by focusing on increasing their advocacy and communication work on the provincial level and cooperating with other important NGOs and actors working with land rights. Awareness raising about communities’ land rights will also be done among public authorities and the private sector on the district and provincial level. At the same time, we will continue to work directly with educating and empowering community members on land rights while focusing on strengthening the still weak local institutional structures that are in place in order to promote fair and secure access to land and resources, including access to revenues from extraction activities.
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**Interviews**
The following sections mentions the list people/organizations that have been interviewed.

**Communities**
- Nacuei (Nimala) - 10
- Nacaca - 4
- Salaue - 30
- Natocua - 6

**Government officials**
- District secretary
- District agricultural department
- District planning and infrastructure department
- SPGC, Forestry department

**AMA/FEFA**
- Project officers
- Project technicians
- Coordinator

**List of persons met**
- FEFA, Columbus Mahanza, programme officer
- FEFA, Jose Vintane, programme technician
- FEFA, Dionisio Carlos Agostinho, programme officer (by email only)
- SDAE, District director for department of agricultural services, Ancuabe district (Julian)
- SDPI, District infrastructure services, assistant technicians,
- District administration, permanent secretary, Ancuabe district
- District head technician on rural planning (August Jameson Anderson)
- COGEP, administrator, Valdmiro Claudio Setimane
- AMA, Coordinator, Tomas Langa,
- Geography and cadastral provincial services technician (and GEOCET)Helio Jose Bronaalo,
- Geography and cadastral provincial services (SPGC: ServiçosProvinciais de Geografia e Cadastro), Chancelarouselobranco, Tiago M. Chelene
- Iniciativa para TerrasComunitarias (ITC), outreach officer (ZenaBilale)

---

5 Salaue have been delimited by Forum Terra with funds from ITC back in 2012 but have not yet received a certificate.
- Village of Nacuei | participants 10
- Village of Nacaca | participants 4
- Village of Salae\textsuperscript{6} | participants 30
- Village of Natocua | participants 6

\textsuperscript{6}Salae have been delimited by Forum Terra with funds from ITC back in 2012 but have not yet received a certificate.