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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction
A Management Information System (MIS) is a system helping managers to run a company or an organisation effectively. It is, especially a computerized system, for gathering the financial, production, and other information that managers need to operate a business. The DoF MIS was established in 1999 with the aim of guiding the DoF in its strategic planning process. Furthermore, it would serve as a powerful tool for decision-making. The DoF MIS entails data and information handling through the Forest Permit System; the Management Reporting System; the Accounting System; the Forest Fire Monitoring System (Fire Scar Mapping); and the Woody Resource Monitoring System (or Forest Resource Information System).

Since it is 3 years after the MIS establishment, it is therefore critical that an assessment of its success is carried out. Therefore, a survey was conducted on two of the five systems that form the MIS: the Forest Permit System and the Management Reporting System. The evaluation was carried out during the period 1-16 December 2002 and involved interviewing both forestry officials and clients who regularly obtain forestry permits. Out of the 15 District Forestry Offices 12 were surveyed. A total of 29 forestry officials and 23 clients participated.

Achievements and constraints on implementation

Forest Permit System
Significant success has been recorded in the implementation of some elements of the computerized Forest Permit System. This is evident from the wide and popular usage of the FPS at all district offices. However, 2 out of the 12 surveyed district forestry offices still issue permits manually, and the permits are later forwarded to the Forestry Head Office where they are entered into the computerized FPS database.

Currently the trend is that Forest Guards and Clerks are taking over the issuing of forestry permits, which was initially done by Forest Rangers and Technicians. This arrangement now relieves and enables both Rangers and Technicians to concentrate on more technical duties. This is a trend that is beneficial to the DoF in view of the limited qualified personnel.

The majority of the clients interviewed expressed satisfaction with both the FPS and the overall services rendered by the DoF. The clients also made important suggestions on how to improve the FPS to enable the DoF to serve the public better. These include the revision of the duration of permits; the establishment of offices to issue permits in areas close to clients; and use of Headmen to issue permits.

Most of the constraints encountered by forestry staff are technical and include the inability to operate computers in general and especially Microsoft Access application on which the computerized FPS is based. Furthermore, the implementation process is also hampered by administrative and technical constraints, which include the acute shortage of computers and lack of measuring equipment for verifying quantities of forest products.
The majority of forest resource users as represented by the clients interviewed are much more concerned with the limited duration of some permits e.g. transport permit, which is valid for 7 days. They are also concerned about the skewed distribution of forestry offices both in communal and commercial areas, which translates to long distances traveled to obtain permits. Since most of the clients are unemployed it becomes difficult to afford transport costs to travel to and from forestry offices for permits.

Management Reporting System
The concept of the MRS seems to be familiar to most DoF staff. However, the implementation process is very slow as the MRS has so far not yet been used by any District Forest Office in its full entirety as originally designed.

The major constraints hampering the implementation of the MRS include lack of supervision from the Forestry Head Office and Forestry Regional Offices at large; lack of computers; and lack of technical know how on computer operations especially Microsoft Access and Microsoft Excel software, and computer care.

Effectiveness of the FPS and MRS to management of the DoF
The survey revealed that the FPS is partially effective in the sense that it is being used as originally intended to collect the data on permits but the managers are not summarizing that data properly into useful information. The reporting feature in the computer FPS is not yet being used to generate the pre-programmed reports and therefore, very little information from the FPS finds its way into the DoF reports.

On the other hand the MRS is ineffective because it is not being used according to its originally designed format and purpose. The MRS is not working as originally intended because the initial input tables Microsoft Excel MRS are not being used at the District level to collect data on activities and hence there is no sharing of digital files from the District to the Forestry Region and the Forestry Head Office. Instead the Quarterly Progress Report sheet is completed manually by the DFOs and forwarded to the Chief Foresters who also manually summarize the data to compile the Regional reports. The Microsoft Excel MRS was originally intended to automatically summarize data for the Forestry District, Forestry Region and Forestry Head Office levels.

Recommendations

1) The most critical area that needs attention is capacity building both in human resources and equipment. Training should address general computer skills (Windows Operating System), computer care and software based operations such as Microsoft Access for FPS and Microsoft Excel for MRS. Equipment to be purchased should include computers, Global Positioning System (GPS) devices, measuring equipment for verifying forest product quantities etc. The GPS devices would be used for locating sites where harvesting has taken place. In addition, training on volume calculations and determination of weights should be provided.

2) In order to address the plight of forest resource users there is a need to open new offices in strategic locations to be identified by the DoF in consultation with various stakeholders.
Since the DoF cannot afford to open offices everywhere there is a need to explore possibilities of using existing institutions such as traditional authorities, Agricultural Rural Development Centers (ARDCs), and Ministry of Agriculture Water and Rural Development (MAWRD) in order to bring permit issuing very close to the people.

3) The duration of forest permits needs to be revised to address the needs of both the forestry clients and the DoF law enforcement officials. The following suggestions were made:
   ➢ Transportation permits should be extended from seven (7) days to fourteen (14) days.
   ➢ The harvesting permit (commercial) for quantities of firewood and poles equal to or less than one (1) ton should be reduced to one (1) week, to minimize the possibility of clients harvesting above what has been authorized in the permit. The harvesting permit for own use should be for one (1) day.
   ➢ The marketing permit should be reduced from six (6) months to one (1) month.

4) The DoF also needs to improve communication with the relevant stakeholders such as the crafts industry and the Directorate of Customs & Excise. This will enable forestry partners to assist the DoF in carrying out effectively its operations of controlling movement of forest products across borders.

5) The success of the implementation of the two systems assessed depends heavily on the strong supervision of the Forestry Regions by the Forestry Head Office, and supervision of the Forestry Districts by the Regional Heads.

6) In order to address the lack of close supervision of the MRS implementation at all levels in the Directorate of Forestry, there is a need to designate one person, preferably a Chief Forester or Deputy Director, who will be responsible for overseeing the MRS implementation. This will be the person to whom the regions will be sending their quarterly reports and he/she will be responsible for producing the Directorate’s Quarterly and Annual Reports. It must be made mandatory for all Forestry Staff in the category of Rangers to the Director to use the MRS in all reports.

7) The DoF must identify one or two staff members in the Forestry Regions who show special and unique computer aptitude to receive further advanced training in order to enable them to assist other staff in the implementation of the MRS in their respective regions.

8) There is need to increase efficiency in handling data concerning forest permits at national level. Again, this requires assigning one person in the Head Office to be responsible for coordinating and summarizing data from forest permit issues into useful decision-making information at the Directorate level. This will solve the current problem whereby there is no central person performing these duties.

9) There is a need to develop a uniform Management Reporting System for the Research Division. The envisaged system should be compatible with the current MRS for Forest Management Division so that the two could feed into each other.

10) Evaluate the quality of the management of the Directorate at all levels and propose appropriate training according to the findings.
11) Assess the linkage and role of MIS to DoF management.

12) Train DOF Managers – Director, Deputy Directors, and Chief Foresters in the role of MIS in the management of organisations.

13) Link FPS to Criteria and Indicators (C&I) process

14) The DoF should consider putting on hold temporarily the introduction of new computer based MIS, especially to the districts, in view of the very slow implementation pace of the current MRS, until such time that district staff are really skilled with the operations of the current MRS and the FPS. The emphasis must be on training and practice to increase proficiency in the use of the existing FPS and MRS.
1. INTRODUCTION

A Management Information System (MIS) is a system helping managers to run a company or an organisation effectively. It is, especially a computerized system, for gathering the financial, production, and other information that managers need to operate a business. The Directorate of Forestry (DoF) commenced the development of a Management Information System (MIS) in November 1998. So far the following systems have been developed:

- Forest Permit System,
- Management Reporting System,
- Accounting System,
- Forest Fire Monitoring System (Fire Scar Mapping), and
- Woody Resource Monitoring System.

The primary objective of the MIS is to support the DoF in decision-making and information handling and thereby contribute towards the attainment of the strategic objectives set by the DoF.

Even though all these systems are important to facilitate rational decision making in the DoF, not all of them are being fully used at present. The Forest Permit System (FPS), Accounting System (AS), Management Reporting System (MRS), and Forest Fire Monitoring System (FFMS) were the first to be developed for use by the DoF. The FPS, AS and MRS were introduced for use in early 1999.

The objective of the FPS system is to control the harvesting, transport and marketing of forest products in Namibia through the issuing of forest permits. Prior to the computerized Forest Permit System, DoF staff were issuing forest permits manually. The Forest Permit System consists of a computerized Microsoft Access Programme specifically designed to issue forest permits and to store the large amount of data, which can then easily be used to generate and summarise various reports on permits. When a client approaches the forestry office for a permit all information is entered directly into the computer and a permit is printed. The forest permit database can further be used to generate various pre-programmed reports about the permits according to different grouping categories.

On the other hand, the purpose of the MRS is to assist District Forest Officers, Chief Foresters and Forest Head Office staff to record all relevant quantitative data on their forestry activities in an easy manner and to easily and timely generate monthly, quarterly and annual reports. The MRS system is based on the Microsoft Excel Programme in which various forestry activities – under Result Areas - are recorded.

The MRS process starts with the District Forest Officers who enter all relevant monthly information on their respective achievements, on various result areas, into predefined fields in the input tables of the Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. The spreadsheet links District Forestry Office input data files to the Regional Forestry Office data files, which are further, linked to the Forestry Head Office data files. The District Forestry Officers must send their respective digital input data files to their Regional Heads who have a summary data file in Excel which automatically reads and sums up into one file all the district input data files. The regions can then use this data to produce their quarterly reports (See Annex 3). The Regional Heads should send
their summary data files to the Forestry Head Office which in turn should use its ‘Head Office summary data file’ to read the three data files from the Forestry Regions. The programme then would automatically add and summarize this information by quarter, districts and forestry regions and finally for the whole Directorate. The resulting information can then be used to produce a national report according to the format in Annex 7.

Three years after the introduction of the FPS DoF staff and other stakeholders have raised various concerns regarding operational problems with the Forest Permit System. In order to address the concerns and remove the bottlenecks from the system concerned, it is firstly, necessary to carry out an evaluation of the system in question in order to identify the problems and, secondly, to recommend solutions to the problems and, thirdly, to actually fix the problems. Therefore, DoF selected the FPS and MRS for evaluation, which was carried out during the period 1-16 December 2002.

1.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The overall objective of the evaluation was to assess the effectiveness of the Forest Permit System and the Management Reporting System. With regard to the MRS the evaluation specifically assessed whether there are problems in the technological parts of the system (PCs, software, the amount of information required), or elsewhere in the system, for instance inadequate utilisation of the information for decision-making.

1.2 METHOD

The evaluation of the FPS and MRS involved extensive interviewing of DoF staff in all regions and clients especially those who obtain permits from the DoF.

1.3 OFFICES VISITED AND PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

The evaluation involved physically visiting Regional and District Forestry Offices in the field and interviewing forestry officials who use the Forest Permit System and Management Reporting System. In addition, clients who obtain permits from the Directorate of Forestry were also interviewed. Twelve (12) forestry offices were visited and a total of 29 Forestry staff and twenty-three (23) clients were interviewed (See Annex 1 and 2).

Questionnaires on the Forest Permit System and Management Reporting System were prepared for DoF staff. A separate questionnaire was developed for the clients. The responses from the questionnaires were entered into a matrix in Microsoft Excel and analysed.
2. FINDINGS/OBSERVATIONS

The introduction of the computerised Forestry Permit System and the computerised Management Reporting System in the DoF has proven to be a step in the right direction. Most respondents interviewed during the survey cited the usefulness of both systems. The Forestry Officials indicated that they are satisfied with both systems in terms of delivery. The other reason for satisfaction was their user-friendliness. The majority of the respondents also cited saving time as one of the strengths of both systems.

The issuing of forest permits is one of the major activities carried out by the DoF. This activity brings the general public into regular and direct contact with the DoF staff on a daily basis. In order to speed up the issuing of forestry permits the DoF staff are compelled to use the computerised FPS, and, as a result, the FPS is the most widely and frequently used management information system (MIS) in the DoF.

On the other hand, the DoF carries out various activities stipulated in its annual objectives. Simple and efficient reporting is essential to enable the DoF to regularly assess and monitor its progress towards the achievement of its annual objectives. The MRS designed in the Microsoft Excel spreadsheet is a very simple and easy to use programme to facilitate reporting for the DoF. However, it turned out that this MRS is not being used in its originally designed form. Instead staff are using only the Quarterly Progress sheet which they fill in manually in conjunction with the Monitoring of Result Indicators form.

Having worked with the systems concerned for a number of years, respondents were able to pick out some of the constraints in using the systems and some suggestions for improvement were also put forward. For the sake of clarity, both constraints and suggestions for improvement will be handled separately for each system under the sub-headings administrative, technical, and capacity/personnel.

2.1 MAJOR CONSTRAINTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT ON THE FOREST PERMIT SYSTEM (FPS)

A number of constraints were identified during the evaluation process. These constraints have been classified into three categories, namely 1) administrative, 2) technical, and 3) capacity/personnel. Following is a summary of the main constraints, raised by the respondents, and proposed suggestions for improvement.

2.1.1 Administrative Constraints

- The duration for the transport permit, which is seven (7) days currently, was observed to be too short. The problem is more pronounced when it comes to commercial operators who export forest products. Once these people miss to transport their products, the permit expires.

- The current system does not stipulate the duration for using forest products harvested. It is silent on the number of users per allocation. For example, if one harvests one (1) ton, it is not clear whether this is per person or per household. Also interesting is the fact that one can
collect a permit to harvest fuel wood for instance, each and everyday without limit in the number of days. There is also a provision in the forests products tariffs table that communities can harvest up to 1 ton for own use without a permit and no duration is specified (see Annex 9).

- There is no fine laid down for those who make alterations on permits.

- It was also indicated that permit offices are not enough and not well distributed to serve clients. Currently, clients have to travel long distances to obtain permits. This is especially cumbersome when it comes to commercial operators who export large quantities of forest products like charcoal and firewood. For example, it was established that some charcoal producers send approximately 30 trucks per month out of Namibia, which involves several transportation permits.

However, the issue of long distance also affects communal areas. In Rundu, clients registered the need for extra offices in the region in order to bring the forestry services closer to the people where some clients travel as much as 90 km to obtain a forestry permit. This will also minimize the risk of illegal harvesting.

- Currently, there is no fine laid down for penalizing those who deliberately obtain wrong permits, in order to benefit themselves illegally.

- The import and export of forest products at the surveyed border points is well established. However, the dilemma is that Customs Officials at these border points do not know what is expected of them in terms of handling forest products moving across these border points.

- Wood carvers are concerned about the high prices charged by the Directorate of Forestry for dead trees, for example for Pterocarpus angolensis which currently stands at N$125 per tree (See Annex 9). It should be noted that most of these dead trees are of low quality due to pest infestation and other defects such as holes in the tree trunks.

Suggestions for improvement

- The FPS should be updated in order to cite the Forestry Act of 2001 as the legal foundation of forestry operations.

- Quantities allocated for harvesting/transport/marketing on the permit should also be in words to avoid people altering the figures.

- Deploy Forestry staff at all strategic border offices of Oshikango (Oshangwena Region), Wenela (Caprivi Region), and Noordoewer (Karas Region), etc. and at checkpoints of Kongola (Caprivi Region), Bagani (Caprivi Region), Mururwani (Kavango Region) and Oshovel (Oshikoto Region) etc. This is in line with the strategy that the Department of Veterinary Services in the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development has employed.
• Relevant documents including the Forest Act and Policy should be made available to the Customs officials at border points, so that they can be informed as to what they should look for when dealing with forest products.

• Set fines to curb the altering of permits.

• Transportation permits should be extended from seven (7) days to fourteen (14) days (i.e. from one to two weeks).

• The harvesting period for quantities of firewood and poles equal to or less than one (1) ton should be reduced to one (1) week, to minimize the possibility of clients harvesting above what has been authorized in the permit. There is also a suggestion of one (1) day for harvesting permit for own use.

• Once the forest resources authorized on the permit have been harvested/transported/marketed, the permit must be cancelled even if the duration is still valid. This will also prevent the possibility of using the same permit more than once, which leads to excessive exploitation of resources.

Whenever forestry officials come across a client who has used the permit, say at roadblocks, the permit could be stumped ‘cancelled’ or alternatively, clients should be mandated to return used permits to the forest offices for cancellation.

• A one (1) ton heap of firewood should be piled at each Forestry Office issuing permits in order to serve as a demonstration to the public. This will help clients to have a concept of what a one (1) ton of firewood looks like.

• The word ‘transport’ which appears on all permits regardless of the type of permit should be changed, so that if the permit is for marketing or harvesting it should state clearly, to ‘market’ or to ‘harvest’ respectively.

• Open a Forest Permit Office at Outjo and Tsumeb where most of commercial charcoal production activities take place.

• Harvesting and marketing permits for droppers (*small poles used in making wire fences*) and poles must be limited to a (one) month period per household or per person. This will enable Forestry Officials to regulate the resources better.

• The harvesting and marketing permits for own use must be determined according to the quantity of products involved.

2.1.2 Technical/Software Constraints

During the survey, it was discovered that some of the problems that the users face are of technical nature. The following is the list of the main technical constraints:
• The FPS does not make provision for generating reports on the number of permits issued according to permit types.

• The FPS does not have a provision for extending duration or validity of permits.

• Electronic capturing of the name of the issuing officer is currently not possible.

• Permit conditions are not printed on the reverse side of the permit.

• The FPS currently sets the expiry date of the permit automatically. This creates problems especially when one gets a permit for a small quantity of forest products. The reason being that it increases the risk of the client in question going back to the forest to harvest more than once (i.e. excess) on the same permit.

• The system has no mechanism for advancing the date on a permit. This is a very serious shortcoming especially when it comes to transport permits. For instance, if one wants to transport resources after two weeks and yet decides to obtain the permit in advance, the permit automatically calculates the duration of the permit from the date of issue (i.e. valid for seven days only), meaning that the permit expires before the actual transportation takes place.

• There are some constituencies not in the current FPS (e.g. Otjombinde, Steinhausen, etc). This makes it difficult to issue permits for people who are to harvest in the constituencies in question.

• All permits are stipulated with a statement saying that they are for transportation purposes. This means that one does not need to take a transportation permit because even the harvesting permit ‘authorizes’ one to transport.

• The harvesting permit does not require information on vehicle registration and destination, which is currently demanded by the computer system. Hence, unnecessary information is captured into the system.

• According to some respondents, the system allows the user to only edit before saving, after that any alteration to the captured data is denied. This makes the system to be inflexible in terms of editing permits.

• The current FPS does not allow users to retrieve previous permits and to modify them. This is indeed a mechanism to prevent fraud. However, it makes issuing several permits to the same person relatively more time consuming. This is mainly because the Officer has to capture the same information required by the same permit-holder repeatedly, according to the number of permits requested.

• The quantity of a bundle is not defined in the Schedule D of the Forest Products Tariffs (See Annex 9).
There are also a number of functions that are not operational, which include 'cancel', 'report back letter', etc. This problem was observed in most offices.

The FPS manual does not seem to be detailed enough and it does not provide guidance on how to add extra parameters like species, constituencies etc. to the relevant table.

Lack of measuring equipments such as scales, weigh bridges, measuring tapes etc. for verifying quantities of forest products being harvested/transported/marketed.

Lack of computers also hamper the issuing of permits regularly as in some cases the same computer needs to be made available for other administrative functions. For example, in Rundu the permits are only issued on certain days, Mondays and Fridays only, in order to accommodate other duties that require the services of the same computer. Consequently, clients suffer due to prolonged delays to obtain permits.

Suggestions for improvements

- The FPS should make room for generating queries for the number of permits issued according to types.

- There must be a mechanism in the computer FPS programme to advance permit dates on the request of the client.

- Addition of missing forest products such as seedlings, palms, etc. should be done as these resources are also being exported and clients normally request permits for their handling.

- Addition of species of fruit trees is also badly needed. This is mainly because the Directorate produces seedlings of fruit trees (i.e. both indigenous and exotic). Since fruit trees are not in the database, it becomes difficult to issue permits for them.

- Modification is necessary so that the permit system will not require vehicle registration and destination when issuing a harvesting permit.

- If 3 or more permits are to be issued to the same client the programme should be flexible enough to give back the saved repetitive information about the client such as name and address so that only the necessary changes such as product quantities can be made instead of re-entering the same client name and address in the database repeatedly. The possibility of copying information from an existing permit and pasting it into a new permit should be explored. If this feature is none existent then it should be included.

- Elaborate the FPS manual to make it more user-friendly and include simple instructions on how to add species, constituencies and other parameters to the pertinent tables.

- The FPS was developed locally therefore there is local expertise to modify the programme to make it more user-friendly.
• Scales are needed at all Forestry Offices in order to determine exactly how much forest resources customers harvest/ transport/ market, instead of guess-estimating. Ideally, weigh bridges are needed and should be used for trucks involved in exports of firewood and charcoal.

• In order to increase accuracy in terms of estimating quantities harvested/ transported/ marketed, staff members involved in law enforcement should carry measuring tapes and any other necessary equipment along. This will enable them to measure the length, breadth and width of the truck and thus calculate the cubic meters involved.

2.1.3 Capacity/Personnel Constraints

• Staff members also experience difficulties in obtaining technical assistance when the system and/or the computer malfunction.

• Generally, staff members are unable to add more species, constituencies and other parameters, to the permit system, when the need for additional parameters arises.

• Limited knowledge of Microsoft Access was cited by several respondents as one of the main problems hampering efficiency in using the FPS.

• Even though forestry rangers are the people responsible for issuing permits on the computer FPS, it turned out that actually Forest guards and Clerks are the staff who use the FPS to issue permits on a daily basis. However, most of these staff (Forest Guards, and Clerks) have very limited knowledge on computer operations in terms of hardware and software.

Suggestions for improvement

• Training in Microsoft Access is of paramount importance, in order to enable staff to do troubleshooting and to make relevant modifications, among others, of adding species and constituencies to the relevant tables.

• A workshop with Traditional Authorities is urgently needed, in order to exchange views on how to regulate forest resources. This will serve as a platform for preventing exploitation of their subjects.

• Forest Guards and Clerks should be specifically targeted for training in computer operations because they are the staff on the ground who actually use the computerised FPS.

• Staff members in law enforcement should be trained in volume and weight calculations.

2.1.4 Other Constraints/Loopholes

• Alteration of quantities and duration stipulated in the permit has been observed in Keetmanshoop. This has led to people re-using the same permit several times.
• There are some clients who obtain permits for harvesting for own use and yet they end up selling their wood. This is just a mechanism to avoid paying the higher fee for the harvesting permit for commercial use.

• There is currently no mechanism for verifying whether the quantity harvested or being transported or marketed corresponds with the one allocated on the permit. This is mainly because clients collect permits before harvesting or transportation of forest products. Furthermore, it was also gathered that trucks transporting charcoal and firewood for export travel after hours or over weekends. For this reason, verification is only possible during law enforcement activities like those carried out at roadblocks in collaboration with the Namibian Police (NAMPOL).

• There are some Traditional Authorities who are exploiting their subjects when they request for an authorisation letter to take to the Forestry Office in order to secure a forest permit. For example, it was learnt that in Kavango some Headmen demand N§50 per letter. However, in Uukwilaudhi Traditional Authority the amount demanded is exorbitant, unaffordable, and currently stands at N§500 if one harvests outside one’s farm, and N§100 if one harvests in his/ her own farm. This is too much bearing in mind that most of the rural community members are unemployed. Besides, these people still have to pay for the forest permits.

• Some influential clients whose forest products are confiscated by DoF law enforcement officers usually phone directly to higher authorities in the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) to seek for the release of their products without paying any fines. The higher authorities then instruct the junior officials to release the confiscated products. This is very discouraging to the law enforcement officers who work very hard to apprehend the offenders.

Suggestions for improvement

• There should be stiffer penalties for people altering product quantities on permits and/or the duration of permits, and for people who obtain harvesting permits for own use but end up selling the forest products.

• Mechanisms should be developed to enable forestry officials to verify the quantity harvested or being transported or marketed that it corresponds with the amount specified on the permit. Among other things, officials should be equipped with measuring equipments like scales and measuring tapes. Officials should also be enabled to visit harvesting areas to monitor the harvesting in the field by allocating specific days and transport on which to carry out such activities.

• It should be investigated whether or not traditional authorities are legally empowered to charge fees for issuing authorisation letters to their subjects to enable such people to obtain permits from the DoF. If it is legal the fees certainly need to be revised downwards as they are too exorbitant.

• When higher authorities in the MET receive complaints from influential clients about confiscation of their forest products, the higher authorities must first institute
investigations into the matter before ordering the immediate release of the confiscated forest products.

2.2 MAJOR CONSTRAINTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT ON THE MANAGEMENT REPORTING SYSTEM (MRS)

The Management Reporting System has been applauded by most Forestry Officers as an easy and very useful system. However, the MRS is not being used fully according to its original designed format and purpose. Only the Quarterly Progress and Monitoring of Result Indicators forms are being used manually. Nevertheless like any other system, this system has some shortcomings, which staff have identified in the activities of the Result Areas and need rectification. A number of these constraints are summarized below. The MRS seems to be familiar to forestry staff except for the fact that some of them do not use it for various reasons. The following is a summary of some of the constraints faced by the officers:

2.2.1 Administrative Constraints

- The MRS is not installed in some districts and thus not used fully at the moment. The main reason is the lack of stringent supervision from the Forestry Head Office to ensure that the MRS is properly installed and used in all offices.

- Some staff raised the concern that they are unable to get help because nobody seems to know what is to be done with the MRS.

- The DoF Head Office does not enforce the use of the MRS on the forestry regions and in turn the forestry regions do not enforce the use of the MRS onto the District Forest Office.

- It was also reported during the survey that a significant number of forestry personnel spend more time playing computer games than performing work. Consequently, this prevents them from practicing using the MRS and other computer operations.

Suggestions for improvement

- The MRS computer programme should be installed or re-installed in all Forestry Offices. Furthermore, there must be room for various offices to adapt it to their local needs, as well as to put it into practice.

- The numbering of Result Areas should also be consistent among all Forestry Offices, in order to minimize confusion. For example, it has been observed that some Districts number result areas differently.

- It must be made mandatory for all Forestry Staff in the category of Rangers to the Director to use the MRS in all reports.

- There is need for improved management at all DoF levels.
2.2.2 Technical/Software Constraints

- At present, the MRS does not have room for comments on the figures provided, which makes figures meaningless at times.

- RA 6: Law enforcement. In the row ‘Permits issued, no’, it is not possible to show the number of permits issued by permit types.

- In Result Area (RA) 7 Afforestation and Reforestation, it is not possible to itemise the row ‘Seedlings planted by others, no’.

- RA 13: District Finances. There is no provision to record revenue from the sale of seedlings, poles, and revenue from various permits.

- RA 7 Afforestation and Reforestation. There is no provision for indicating trees planted in a particular location and date of planting.

- The revenue section RA 13, the row ‘Total value of revenue receipts, N\$’ is lumped together (i.e. includes that for permits, timber, etc).

- Lack of computers on which to implement the MRS, as most of the offices have only one computer per district. This situation makes it difficult for officers to implement the system as most of the time the Clerks or Forest Guards are busy using computers for permits and other administrative aspects. Since using the MRS is a skill, one tends to forget if one does not practice.

Suggestions for improvement

- Use and export of forest products by permit types should be included. RA 6: Law Enforcement. The row ‘Permits issued, no’ should be itemised to specify the numbers of different permits issued:
  - Harvesting
  - Transport
  - Marketing

- The revenue section should be itemized, and must include droppers and seedlings.

- RA 7: Afforestation and Reforestation. A row should be included for ‘Seedlings in stock at the beginning of new financial year’.

- RA 7: Afforestation and Reforestation. The row ‘Seedlings planted by others, no’ should be itemised to show:
  - Seedlings planted by schools
  - Seedlings planted by churches
  - Seedlings planted by individuals
  - Seedlings planted by farmers
• The MRS should also document quantities of exports of droppers, firewood, seedlings, etc collected from the Forestry District concerned.

• Purchase more computers for the districts in order to afford forestry staff members to practice their skills.

2.2.3 Capacity/Personnel Constraints

• A number of Forestry Staff did not receive training on how to use the MRS. Furthermore there is an increasing number of new staff who were not in the DoF when the MRS was introduced for implementation to the DoF staff in 1999 at a workshop in Keetmashoop.

• It is difficult to understand some of the terminology in the MRS. For example, RA 8, the row ‘Adoption rate of sp. Related practices,%’.

• The MRS is not being used according to the original format. Instead most staff are only using the ‘Quarterly Progress Form’ and ‘Monitoring of result Indicators Form’, which are printed and filled in manually and finally summed up manually to obtain regional totals. This process slows down the preparation of quarterly reports.

• Most Forestry Officials are not aware of the outline (See Annex 7) of both quarterly and annual reports which should be used along with the MRS. They assume that the Progress Report Input Table and the Quarterly Progress Report Form are the end product reports and that these should be made available for public information.

Suggestions for improvement

• Using Microsoft Excel is easy. It is one of those readily available generic programmes. However, the installation of the MRS computer programme in all Forestry Offices should be followed through by training on implementation and troubleshooting.

• There should be training in basic computer maintenance (cleaning - do’s and dont’s). This is important and necessary in addition to the computer skills in order to enhance computer functionality and life.

• Even though the MRS was designed and developed in Finland under the NFFP I, local expertise in Microsoft Excel is available to modify the MRS so as to incorporate the necessary required changes into the system.
3. CONCLUSIONS

3.1 Forest Permit System (FPS)

The implementation process for the FPS was observed to be well established in almost all the Forestry Offices. It was also discovered that the issuing of permits is done by Forest Guards and Clerks, instead of Forest Rangers and Technicians as previously assumed. The staff and in particular the Forest Guards and Clerks were very eager to use the system. This situation is advantageous to the Directorate due to lack of qualified personnel, in the sense that both Forest Rangers and Technicians are able to concentrate on more technical operations than to spend time on capturing data into the computer system. Therefore, Forest guards and clerks deserve further training to enable them to handle the computer FPS effectively.

It was also noted that a large number of Forestry Staff on the ground do not have the skill on operating Microsoft Access. Consequently, they are not able to do troubleshooting. Their inability to understand computer operations inhibits them from describing the problems and hence from seeking appropriate assistance when they run into difficulties. Furthermore, as an example they cannot even add new species names or constituencies to the database. In some cases, it was also found that computers are non operational or where operational they had minor technical problems. This could be attributed, among other things, to lack of proper care, as most of the computers concerned are relatively new. The lack of proper care was evident from the dust on computer monitors and external modems.

3.1.1 Clients

A large number of clients interviewed were generally satisfied with the service of the Forestry Staff with regard to the current Forest Permit system. However, a number of concerns were raised with regard to the issues below. The responses, out of the 22 clients interviewed, are given in percent (%) following each issue:

- Inadequate duration of permits, 73%
- High prices for tree species, 45%
- Lack of Forestry Offices, 68%
- Additional charges demanded by Traditional Authorities, 59%
- Confiscation of forest products by Forestry Staff, 50%
- Limited days, Monday & Friday only, of issuing permits, especially in Rundu, 50%
- Lack of grace period for renewal of permits, 45%
- Lack of grace period to allow clients to pay for their confiscated products, 45%
- Aggression of Law Enforcement Officers in the field who go to an extent of using Namibian Special Field Force to apprehend clients with expired permits, 45%

3.2 Management Reporting System (MRS)

The implementation process of the MRS on the ground was observed to be too slow. This is due to a number of reasons which include among others lack of supervision from the Head Office on the implementation of decisions at regional levels, as well as lack of supervision from regional offices to the districts; lack of technical ability to do simple computer operations by some staff
members despite the simplicity of using the Microsoft Excel spreadsheet; and shortage of computers in District Offices.

It was also observed that there is a general unwillingness to take up new challenges by staff members. This can be attributed to lack of training in computer operations and in particular Microsoft Excel on which the system is based. It was also noted from the survey that the system is perceived to be too demanding and user-unfriendly despite the fact that Excel is one of those generic programmes that can be easily mastered by a person with an average computer skill. During the survey, it was also noted that almost all Forestry Offices do not have the computerized system. Instead, they are using the Quarterly Progress and Monitoring of Result Indicators Forms, which are completed manually. It was however not clear as to why the system was absent.

It was also observed that the Microsoft Excel MRS implementation is only for the Forest Management Division. It appears that there is no Management Reporting System for the Forest Research Division. Currently, each sub-division/section within the Research Division namely National Forest Inventory, National Remote Sensing Centre, Research Programmes and Research Stations, has its own reporting format. The format for Research Programmes sub-division is shown in Annex 8 while the format for the other sections is unknown. However, despite the fact that the entire Research Division does not use the Microsoft Excel MRS the summarisation of information shown in Appendix 8 more or less corresponds to the Management Division's outline for Quarterly Report, especially item 2, in Appendix 7.

With regard to the MRS technically there is really nothing wrong with the programme. It has not even been extensively or intensively used. The few technical constraints mentioned by respondents are minor and modifications can easily be made to the programme to incorporate the proposed changes. However, the major problem with regard to the use of the MRS lies mainly in the lack of supervision and commitment at both DoF Head-Office level and Regional Forestry Office level to implement the system.

3.3 Role of FPS and MRS to support management of the DoF

It must be noted that the evaluation of the FPS and MRS focussed mainly on the computer side of operation of the systems and the difficulties staff have to operate the computer systems. It did not look at the overall picture of each system in terms of how they contribute to the management of the Directorate of Forestry through provision of information.

However, it must be borne in mind that the FPS and MRS are only tools meant to generate data and information to support managers in decision-making. Therefore the managers must understand how these systems fit in in the organisation and how the systems are meant to assist them in the overall management of their organisation.

The FPS has a role to play in forest management by providing information, which can be used to promote the development of sustainable forest management in Namibia. In this regard the FPS could be linked to Criteria and Indicators (C&I) to provide data and information on the harvesting of resources in Namibia. Furthermore, despite the fact that it is very clear what role the FPS is expected to play in the management of the DoF, the use of the data and information is
not yet fully maximised at this stage and therefore efforts must be made towards this end. On the other hand the MRS is also expected to play a crucial role in the management of the DoF through provision of information for work planning, motivation of staff, monitoring resource allocation for various activities, supervision of field staff etc. Again whether the overall MRS functions well to support the management of DoF is not yet well established.

Therefore, improvements in the computer side alone of the FPS and MRS cannot and will not in itself bring about long lasting change in the management of the DoF unless those improvements are accompanied by corresponding improvements in the managers who depend on and must use the systems for overall management of the Directorate.

Management is generally understood to mean the activities, and often the group of people, involved in the four general functions of:

1) **Planning**, including identifying goals, objectives, methods, resources needed to carry out methods, responsibilities and dates for completion of tasks.

2) **Organizing** resources to achieve the goals in an optimum fashion. Examples are organizing new departments, human resources, office and file systems, re-organizing businesses, etc.

3) **Leading**, including to set direction for the organization, groups and individuals and also influence people to follow that direction, and

4) **Controlling**, or coordinating, the organization’s systems, processes and structures to effectively and efficiently reach goals and objectives. This includes ongoing collection of feedback, and monitoring and adjustment of systems, processes and structures accordingly.

Therefore, both the FPS and MRS have a role to play in assisting DoF managers in carrying out planning, organising, leading and controlling of the DoF. It is in this regard that the following issues should be further explored:

- Evaluation of the quality of the management of the Directorate at all levels;
- Assessing the linkage and role of MIS to DoF management;
- Training DOF Managers – Director, Deputy Directors, and Chief Foresters in the role MIS plays in the management of organisations; and
- Linking FPS to Criteria and Indicators (C&I) process
4. RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 GENERAL

The effective implementation of both the FPS and MRS depends heavily on the availability of appropriate hardware and software. And, currently the lack of computers is one of the major obstacles in the implementation of both systems. It is therefore proposed that the Directorate of Forestry increases its efforts to acquire more computers in order to facilitate the implementation of both systems at district level. Secondly, capacity building in computer hardware and software operations is of critical importance to enable the concerned DoF staff to use the FPS and MRS effectively.

4.2 FOREST PERMIT SYSTEM

1) Training in Microsoft Access is of paramount importance, in order to enable Forestry staff to do troubleshooting and to make relevant modifications such as adding species and constituencies to the relevant tables.

2) The computerised FPS still needs attention in terms of making it more user-friendly. Those Offices that still issue permits manually need to obtain the computerized Forest Permit system.

3) Forestry Offices need to be established in strategic areas. The most urgent locations include Outjo and Tsumeb. The reason being that these two locations have a high concentration of charcoal and firewood producers and exporters who find it difficult and an inconvenience to travel to Otjiwarongo and Grootfontein respectively for permits.

4) There is a need to increase efficiency in handling data concerning forest permits at national level. This calls for assigning one person in the Head Office to be responsible for coordinating and summarizing forest permit issues at the Directorate. This will solve the current problem whereby there is no central person performing these duties. Consequently, the Windhoek District forestry Office has to be burdened with this responsibility. This has proven not to function efficiently as most of the information in the permit system is not being used for decision making. In order to promote the use of the information a much more user friendly presentation of the data in form of graphs and tables should be devised.

5) In order to solve Forestry Offices’ inability to verify quantities harvested/transported/marketed, scales and measuring tapes need to be acquired for all Forestry Offices and training in volume and weight calculations provided. Furthermore, GPS devices need to be acquired for all the Offices so as to enable them to document sites where forest resources are harvested. In addition, weigh bridges are needed for trucks involved in exports of firewood and charcoal, but this requires collaboration with the Directorate of Customs & Excise and the Ministry of Transport responsible for weigh bridges.
6) Relevant information including documents such as the Forest Act and Policy should be made available to the Customs officials at border points, so that they can be informed as to what they should look for when dealing with forest resources. Additionally, Ministry of Finance’s Customs Officials should be added to the Directorate’s stakeholder list for workshops and meetings to enhance information exchange and collaboration.

7) The deployment of Forestry staff at certain border posts where the movement of forest products is more pronounced such as Oshikango (Oshangwena Region), Wenela (Caprivi Region) and Noordoewer (Karas Region) is also an option to be explored. This should also include checkpoints such as Kongola, Bagani, Mururwani, Oshivelvo, etc.

8) The duration of permits needs to be amended according to the following suggestions:
   - Transportation permits should be extended from seven (7) days to fourteen (14) days.
   - The harvesting permit (commercial) for quantities of firewood and poles equal to or less than one (1) ton should be reduced to one (1) week, to minimize the possibility of clients harvesting above what has been authorized in the permit. The harvesting permit for own use should be for one (1) day.
   - The marketing permit should be reduced from six (6) months to one (1) month.

9) The Forestry conditions on the reverse (back) side of the permit must include a statement on the cancellation of used permits. This will also prevent the possibility of using the same permit repeatedly, which leads to excessive exploitation of resources.

10) Since the Directorate of Forestry does not have the means to open permit offices in all areas where the permit services are needed, it is proposed that the issuing of permits should be delegated to Headmen, and Agricultural Rural Development Centres (ARDCs) under the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development (MAWRD) - in such areas. Legal and administrative mechanisms for making Headmen ‘Receivers of Revenue’ should be explored. Furthermore, for extremely remote areas, the Directorate of Forestry should establish a ‘Mobile Permit-Issuing Unit’, which could visit such areas on designated days.

11) Since the Traditional Authorities are charging clients exorbitant fees for authorization to use forest resources in their respective areas, the Directorate of Forestry should urgently organize a workshop for Traditional Leaders and other stakeholders to exchange views on how to regulate and utilize forest resources. This will serve as a platform for preventing over-exploitation of their innocent subjects.

12) Clients are concerned that the current prices of dead trees are too high. It is therefore proposed that these prices should be revised in order to make them both affordable and accessible to the communities who depend on them for livelihood. Furthermore, communities were concerned that the Directorate of Forestry was more interested in protecting trees than in improving their livelihood through sustainable use of forest resources and thereby promote poverty alleviation.

13) Since most community members do not have a reliable steady source of income, it is proposed that they should be granted grace periods when it comes to renewal of
permits and payment for their confiscated forest products. The Directorate of Forestry should determine the appropriate duration for the grace period.

4.3 MANAGEMENT REPORTING SYSTEM

1) There is a need to develop a uniform Management Reporting System for the Research Division. The envisaged system should be compatible with the current MRS for Forest Management Division so that the two could feed into each other.

2) Training of all Forestry staff must be carried out from the category of Ranger to the Director in the use of the MRS. This is crucial to the successful future implementation of the MRS. This training should include troubleshooting and general computer operations. Furthermore, one or two staff members who show special and unique computer aptitude in the regions should receive further advanced training in order to enable them to assist others in the implementation of the MRS in their respective regions.

3) To be able to address the supervision of the implementation of the MRS at all levels in the Directorate of Forestry, there is a need to designate one person preferably a Chief Forester or Deputy Director who will be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the MRS. This will be the person to whom the regions will be sending their quarterly reports and he/she will be responsible for producing the Directorate's Quarterly and Annual Reports. It must be made mandatory for all Forestry Staff in the category of Rangers to the Director to use the MRS in all reports.

4) The MRS computer programme should be installed in all Forestry Offices. In addition there should be room to enable various offices to adapt it to their local needs, as well as to put it into practice.

5) The numbering of Result Areas should also be consistent among all Forestry Offices, in order to minimise confusion. This is based on the fact that Forestry District Offices tend not to stick to the established sequence of numbering result areas.

6) To be able to solve problems related to technical implementation of the MRS, a comprehensive manual similar to the one for the Forest Permit System is needed.

7) The fact that the MRS is not properly used in its entirety according to the original purpose means that not all relevant information is being captured in the quarterly reports to facilitate decision making both at district, regional and forestry head office levels. Hence it is of utmost importance to operationalise the MRS according to the original purpose.

8) Due to a significant amount of time lost playing computer games it would do the DoF justice to strengthen managerial skills or to delete all computer games from all offices. This will give staff enough time to attend to the MRS and other computer skills.

9) Finally, in view of the very slow pace of the MRS implementation, the DoF should consider putting on hold temporarily the introduction of new computer based Management Information Systems especially to the districts until such time that
district staff are really conversant with the operations of the current MRS and the FPS.

4.4 Role of FPS and MRS to support management

Following are some recommendations on improving the role of MIS to management of the DoF:

1) Evaluate the quality of the management of the Directorate at all levels and propose appropriate training according to the findings.

2) Assess the linkage and role of MIS to DoF management.

3) Train DOF Managers – Director, Deputy Directors, and Chief Foresters in the role MIS plays in the management of organisations.

4) Link FPS to Criteria and Indicators (C&I) process.
Annexes
Annex 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE for Evaluation of the DoF Forest Permit System and Management Reporting System

1. BACKGROUND

The Directorate of Forestry (DoF) commenced the development of a Management Information System (MIS) in November 1998. So far the systems that have been developed are:
- Forest Permit System
- Management Reporting System
- Accounting System
- Forest Fire Monitoring System (Fire Scar Mapping)
- Woody Resource Monitoring System

The primary objective of the MIS is to support the DoF in decision-making and information handling and thereby contribute towards the attainment of the strategic objectives set by the DoF.

Even though all these systems are important to facilitate rational decision making in the DoF, not all systems are being fully used at present. The Forest Permit System (FPS), Management Reporting System (MRS) and Forest Fire Monitoring System (FFMS) are fully operational.

The objective of the FPS system is to control the harvesting, transport and marketing of forest products in Namibia through the issuing of forest permits. Prior to the computerized Forest Permit System, DoF staff were issuing forest permits manually. The Forest Permit System consists of a computerized Microsoft Access Programme specifically designed to issue forest permits and to store the large amount of data, which can then easily be used to generate and summarise various reports on permits. When a client approaches the forestry office for a permit all information is entered directly into the computer and a permit is printed.

The purpose of the MRS is to assist District Forest Officers, Chief Foresters and Forest Head Office staff to record all relevant quantitative data on their forestry activities in an easy manner and to easily and timely generate monthly, quarterly and annual reports. The MRS system is based on the Microsoft Excel Programme in which various forestry activities are recorded. The process starts with the District Forest Officers who enter all relevant monthly information on their respective achievements into predefined fields in the spreadsheet. The spreadsheet links District Forestry Office data sheets to the Regional Forestry Office data sheets, which are further, linked to the Forestry Head Office data sheets. The programme then automatically summarises this information by quarter, districts and forestry regions and finally the whole Directorate. Reasons for any unusual deviations from annual targets are also described in a separate section of the report.

DoF staff and other people have raised various concerns regarding operational problems with some of the systems such as the Forest Permit System. In order to address the concerns and remove the bottlenecks from the systems, it is firstly, necessary to carry out an evaluation of the systems in question in order to identify the problems and, secondly, to recommend solutions to the problems and, thirdly, to actually fix the problems.
The evaluation of the FPS and MRS involves extensive interviewing of DoF staff and other relevant stakeholders such as those who obtain permits from DoF. For MRS, it should specifically assess whether there are problems in the technological parts of the system (PCs, software, the amount of information required), or elsewhere in the system, for instance in inadequate utilisation of the information for decision-making.

2. **OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**

The overall objective of the evaluation is to assess the effectiveness of the Forest Permit System and the Management Reporting System.

3. **ACTIVITIES**

- Compile a questionnaire
- Visit major District Forestry Offices in Namibia
- Gather opinions of DoF staff and major clients on the Forest Permit System
- Gather opinions of DoF staff on the Management Reporting System
- Analyse the results, prepare recommendations and submit a final report, taking into account comments received on the report drafts.

4. **VENUE OF THE EVALUATION AND DURATION**

District Forestry Offices of Namibia, as indicated separately


Report writing will be carried out in Windhoek.

5. **EVALUATOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE**

- Appropriate degree with 5 years of appropriate professional experience
- Knowledge and experience in basic computer hardware and software
- Fluency in English, however, Afrikaans is an added advantage

6. **REPORTING**

A final draft report on the findings and recommendations will be produced and circulated by 6 January 2003.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 1 Dec</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Travel Windhoek - Keetmanshoop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 2 Dec</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Meet DoF staff and clients in Keetmanshoop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Travel Keetmanshoop - Mariental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 3 Dec</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Meet DoF staff and clients in Mariental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Travel Mariental - Gobabis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, 4 Dec</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Meet DoF staff and clients in Gobabis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Travel Gobabis - Otjiwarongo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 5 Dec</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Meet DoF staff and Clients in Otjiwarongo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Travel Otjiwarongo - Grootfontein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 6 Dec</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Meet DoF staff and Clients in Grootfontein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Travel to Rundu: Meet DoF staff and clients in Rundu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, 7 Dec</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Rundu: Meet Mariental DFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, 8 Dec</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Travel Rundu – Katima Mulilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 9 Dec</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Meet DoF staff and clients in Katima Mulilo, Wenela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Border Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Travel Katima Mulilo - Rundu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, 10 Dec</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Travel Rundu – Oshakati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Public Holiday)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, 11 Dec</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Travel Oshakati – Eenhana: Meet DoF staff and clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in Eenhana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Oshikango Border Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 12 Dec</td>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Travel Oshakati – Outapi: Meet DoF staff and clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at Outapi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, 13 Dec</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Travel Oshakati Eenhana: Fire Policy Workshop issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Ongwediva: Meet DoF staff at Ongwediva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, 14 Dec</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Travel Oshakati - Windhoek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Meet DoF staff and clients in Outapi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, 15 Dec</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Resting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 16 Dec</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Meet DoF staff and clients in Okahandja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Meet DoF staff and in Windhoek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 4: Results of Clients responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percent (%) responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you understand Permit Conditions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the permit duration adequate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are you satisfied with permit rates</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are DoF staff available to issue permit at all times</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are Forestry offices adequate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is it easy to obtain change</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Are DoF staff Friendly</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do permit officials provide enough information</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unit No.</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Rate the service rendered by DoF permit office</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unit No.</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. How much time do you spend waiting for a permit</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Issues raised by clients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate duration of permits</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied with tree prices</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoF staff not available (Rundu Office)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Authorities demand extra charges</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products confiscated after permit expiry</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited days for issuing permits (Rundu Office)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of grace period for permit renewal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of grace period for redemption of confiscated products</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression when confiscating Products</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For all the 4 above tables there were 22 clients or respondents.
Annex 5: Results of FPS responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Not easy</th>
<th>Have not used it</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is easy it to use the computer FPS</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Data entry</th>
<th>Printing forms</th>
<th>Printing reports</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>Non response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Where do you have problems with FPS</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percent (% responses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Are you aware of FPS manual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Can you follow manual instructions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are you satisfied with permit duration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do FPS entry forms meet your needs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is FPS time saving</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Are you familiar with computer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Are you familiar with MS Access</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number of times the job category was mentioned by respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Who uses the FPS</td>
<td>Forester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCHEDULE D

Commercial Non timber Forest Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Product</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Price (N$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grass</td>
<td>bundle</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeds</td>
<td>bundle</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makalani palm leaves</td>
<td>bundle</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamental dry roots</td>
<td>ton</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCHEDULE E

Service Fee for Permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Permit</th>
<th>Validity</th>
<th>Service Fee (N$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvest permit (Commercial)</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing permit (Commercial)</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport permit (Commercial)</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport permit (own use - up to 1 tonne)</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export permit (Commercial)</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>5.00/tonne up to 10 tonnes, 4.00 for each additional tonne per consignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export permit (Own use - up to 1 tonne)</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>