



THE DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF THE SELOUS – NIASA WILDLIFE CORRIDOR

Project Number: 00038545

PIMS Number 1135

TERMINAL EVALUATION

FINAL REPORT

Report Prepared by



*Oliver Chapeyama
And
Deo-Gratias Gamassa
July 2009*



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	6
1.0 Introduction	16
1.1 Objectives of the Evaluation	16
1.2 Valuation Methodology	18
1.3 Structure of the Report	19
2.0 Project Concept and Design	20
2.1 Background	20
2.2 Project and its Development Context	22
2.3 Project Design	24
2.4 Project Revision	25
2.5 Project Budget and Financial Planning	26
3.0 Findings and Conclusions	27
3.1 Findings	27
4.0 Results to Date	34
5.0 Project Impact and Sustainability	58
5.1 Project Impact	58
5.2 Project Effectiveness	59
5.3 Project Relevance	59
5.4 Project Efficiency	59
5.5 Project Sustainability	60
5.6 Contribution to skills Upgrading	63
6.0 Lessons learnt	63
7.0 Conclusions and Recommendations	63
7.1 Conclusions	63
7.2 Recommendations	66
8.0 Annexes	70

List of Tables

Table 1:	Project Budget
Table 2:	Project Achievements against Objectives
Table 3:	Project Progress against Outcomes
Table 4:	Overall Project Assessment
Table 5:	Assessment of Sustainability of Project Outcomes

Annexes

Annex 1:	Terms of Reference
Annex 2:	List of People Interviewed
Annex 3:	Schedule of Visits
Annex 4:	References

Acronyms and Terms

AA	Authorised Association
CBC	Community-based Conservation
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CIC	International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation
CO	UNDP Country Office
FCS	Financial Consulting Services
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographic Information System
GTZ-IS	German Technical Cooperation International Services
KfW	German Development Cooperation Bank
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MIT	Massachussettes Institute of Technology
MKUKUTA	Mkakati wa Kukuza Uchumi na Kuondoa Umaskini Tanzania
MTE	Mid Term Evaluation
NSGRP	National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty
PA	Protected Area
SADC	Southern Africa Development Community
SCP	Selous Conservation Programme
SNWC	Selous-Niassa Wildlife Corridor
TA	Technical Adviser
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TNRF	Tanzania Natural Resources Forum
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
URT	United Republic of Tanzania
WMA	Wildlife Management Area
WPT	Wildlife Policy of Tanzania

Acknowledgements

The authors of this report would like to express their appreciation to the staff at UNDP Tanzania for all the support they provided in facilitating the conduct of this evaluation.

Special acknowledgement is also made of all Government of the Republic of Tanzania staff interviewed during the evaluation, the Project Management staff of GTZ-IS at Namtumbo and all Regional and District staff in Ruvuma Region who provided information on various aspects of the project. The comments received from these various stakeholders during briefing sessions assisted with the finalization of this report.

Last but not least, the inputs made by project participants and beneficiaries in the villages visited during the evaluation are most appreciated.

Executive Summary

The Development and Management of the Selous-Niassa Wildlife Corridor project is a Nationally Executed initiative that is funded by UNDP GEF and executed by the United Republic of Tanzania Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism through a contract with GTZ- International Services. The total project budget is US\$ 2, 060,000 including an initial PDF A grant of US\$ 13,500 for project formulation. The project, which has been under implementation since July 2005, will end in July 2009.

The project was intended to specifically promote the establishment of a network of community-based Wildlife Management Areas and empower the local community as resource managers in order to enable conservation and sustainable use of the wildlife corridor between two large existing Game Reserves (Selous 50,000 sq km and Niassa 42,400 sq km) making a total protected ecosystem of over 1200,000 sq km. The project addressed emerging GEF priorities of: *Catalyzing sustainability of Protected Areas (PAs) in particular improving opportunities for sustainable use, benefit sharing and broad stakeholder participation among communities.* Project components were designed to support the Wildlife Policy of Tanzania directly by contributing to the establishment of a network of protected area systems that are managed by local communities.

This report details the findings of an independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) conducted between June 15 and July 15, 2009 “to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the Selous – Niassa Wildlife Corridor project by assessing its project design, the process of implementation and results and outputs vis-à-vis project objectives endorsed by the GEF and other partners (Govt, UNDP, KfW) including the agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation.”

The Terminal Evaluation was conducted through the performance of the following tasks:

- Assess overall performance and review progress towards attaining the project’s objectives and results including relevancy, efficiency and effectiveness of the actions taken given the available funding and capacities for implementation.
- Review and evaluate the extent to which the project outputs and outcomes have been achieved, and the shortcomings in reaching project objectives as stated in the project document.
- Assess the project results and determine the extent to which the project objective was achieved, or is expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to any positive or negative consequences.
- Assess the extent at which the project impacts have reached or have the potential to reach the intended beneficiaries; in particular, the balance

between conservation and livelihood actions spearheaded through the project.

- Critically analyze the implementation arrangements and identify strengths and weaknesses in the project design and implementation
- Describe the project's adaptive management strategy – how have project activities changed in response to new conditions, (e.g. recommendations of the MTE) and have the changes been appropriate in particular the issue of capacity;
- Assess the project's contribution to the GEF Strategic Priority for catalyzing sustainability of Protected Areas (PAs) in particular improving opportunities for sustainable use, benefit sharing and broad stakeholder's participation among communities.
- Review the clarity of roles and responsibilities of the various agencies and institutions and the level of coordination between relevant players. In particular look at the roles of the Project team, district authorities, and MNRT.
- Assess the level of stakeholder involvement in the project from community to higher Government levels and recommend on whether this involvement has been appropriate to the goals of the project.
- Describe and assess efforts of UNDP (CO and UNDP-GEF) in support of the implementation.
- Review donor partnership processes, and the contribution of co-finance.
- Describe key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects for sustainability of project results achieved. Assess the likelihood of continuation of project activities/results, outcomes/benefits after completion of GEF funding, considering the “traditional” economic activities in which these communities are involved.
- Identify and document the main successes, challenges and lessons that have emerged in terms of:
 - a) *Strengthening country ownership, initiative and leadership;*
 - b) *Community level assessment and stakeholder participation at all stages of the project cycle;*
 - c) *Communication approaches and strategies and their impact on behavioral changes and raising awareness at all levels – both in country, regionally and internationally.*
 - d) *Application of adaptive management strategies;*
 - e) *National cooperation, intra governmental cooperation and other project management initiatives*
 - f) *Efforts to secure sustainability; (see the new GEF format for assessment of sustainability)*

g) Role of M&E in project implementation as required by GEF guidelines.

The TE was conducted by an international consultant and a national consultant. The Team started by reviewing project documents including the project document, project progress and financial reports as well as documents pertaining to similar projects being implemented in the project area. National legislation and development guideline documents were also reviewed to establish their implications for project implementation. Document review culminated in the production of an Inception Report that indicated the evaluation strategy the team was to follow. Field work to Ruvuma region Namtumbo and Tunduru Districts was conducted between June 17 and June 24. Following the field visits, the team conducted out briefings with the stakeholders in Songea as well as with UNDP management in Dar-es-salam. The evaluation concluded with report writing which was done between June 24 and July 15 2009.

The TE was fielded to review overall project performance from initiation to completion. The process was informed by the findings of a MTE that was conducted in 2007.

The following five programmatic outcomes were expected at the end of the project:

- I. Greater awareness and capacities for conservation of biodiversity and natural resources within the corridor among communities, local and district authorities;
- II. Reliable ecological and socio-economic databases for the corridor to serve as decision-making tools for communities and local authorities established;
- III. A network of WMAs effectively established and managed throughout the corridor;
- IV. The Sasawara Forest Reserve protected through community participation
- V. Best practices for community managed protected areas disseminated.

In evaluating the project the consulting team was mindful of the following factors that had implications for the achievement of the expected outcomes: The project started as pioneer initiative in a remote and very underdeveloped part of Tanzania. The project office was established in Namtumbo, a newly established district which was characterized by very basic infrastructure and services. As a result, the district did not have skilled personnel as could be found in other relatively developed districts in the country. Project implementation would be affected by these conditions.

There were delays experienced with project mobilization at the start of the project while most of the potential co-financing partners had already concluded their negotiations during the long period of 4 years between the application and actual start of the project. This resulted in limited co-financing being available to the project.

The project was manned by a very small project team. Despite this, the project managed to attract national and international attention. This resulted in increased interest among development partners which has seen organizations such as KfW and ADAP supporting complimentary projects in the project area. Some of these

organizations will carry on supporting activities that were initiated under the project but could not be completed at the close of the initiative.

Overall, the project has implemented most of the activities that were set out at the beginning. The evaluation rates the project as having been “Highly Successful.”

Lessons Learnt

Wildlife management and conservation projects require baseline data so that progress with their implementation can be tracked over their implementation timeframes.

The project area is in a remote part of Tanzania which was also adversely affected by the negative security situation that was caused by the Mozambican liberation war and the subsequent civil war. This situation meant that comprehensive ecological surveys could be conducted in the area prior to project implementation. The Selous Niassa Wildlife Corridor Research project that was carried out in cooperation with the Institute for Zoo and Wildlife Research Berlin, TAWIRI, University SUA Morogoro , Wildlife Department and GTZ projects between 2001 and 2003 formed the first comprehensive ecological survey that has been conducted in the area. This has been augmented by aerial animal censuses that have been conducted over the area since 1998. The Ruvuma River Study that was conducted in the Corridor on 174 km river length in cooperation with the Niassa National Reserve in 2006 also provides a detailed description of the wildlife, fish, birdlife, crocodile populations and socio-economic issues along Ruvuma River. The SNWC project also funded a socio-economic survey of the corridor area which however was adjudged to be inadequate. Because of the short time frame covered by these studies and surveys, the baseline situation in the corridor is not clearly understood resulting in assessments of animal populations in the project area being at best anecdotal. This is an issue which will need to be attended to in future to enable project managers to track the changes taking place with regards to the ecological and socio-economic situation in the project area.

The project objective was to achieve integrated conservation and development with local communities as key actors and beneficiaries. This aspect introduced a clear political dimension to the project which was correctly articulated by project management right from the beginning. Stakeholder buy-in was solicited through consultations involving a broad spectrum of interest groups including administrative, political and civil society entities represented in both the Tanzania section of the corridor as well as the Niassa district of Mozambique.

The project also recognized the importance of land in the social and economic development processes in the corridor area.

Natural resources and land were recognized as the lifeline of rural communities in the project area. This explains the attention given to land management legislation by

the project at the outset. Capacity building was tailored on land legislation, land utilization and land management with integrated natural resources management in cooperation with InWent, Capacity Building International, Germany and the University of Dar es Salaam and Sokoine Morogoro.

Literacy levels are low in the project area resulting in traditions taking a strong hold on social development initiatives. This usually results in the marginalization of women in the process. The SNWC Project however promoted the participation of women in training programmes resulting in them playing an active role in the institutions such as natural resources committees and community based organizations that have been built during the project lifespan. Village Natural Resources Committees and Community Based Organizations, both have a high percentage of women in leading positions.

Community projects require provision of sustainable sources of funding for them to survive beyond donor support. The project has built an environment that is supportive of the establishment of both individual as well as group based IGA enterprises. However, these initiatives and groups will need start-up capital for them to establish viable enterprises. It is noteworthy that the project has introduced the concept of SACCOS banks through the Chamber of Commerce of Ruvuma Region. A bank has recently opened a branch at Lusewa which is expected to cater for the entire southern region of the corridor. In addition, the project provided enterprise development and management training to members of CBOs participating in the activities supported by SNCWP. This training emphasized the need for the introduction of the SACCOs Banking system as a source of credit.

There is a need for the SNWCP initiative to be linked to global initiatives such as climate change mitigation through which additional resources can be leveraged to support development programmes in the area. The MNRT under FBD is implementing a REDD project it's the objective of which is to reward those who reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. In simple terms, it "pays those that reduce deforestation and forest degradation". The SNWP objectives are relevant to the REDD project and communities can be beneficiaries from this initiative. Since Sasawara Forest Reserve is managed by FBD it is an appropriate pilot site in the corridor area. The core benefit from proper management of the forest under REDD is enhanced capacity of the area as a carbon sink and co-benefits will be improved catchment, biodiversity conservation, soil fertility and productivity in adjacent farming communities. There are stringent conditions for a community or an individual to trade carbon on the carbon market. Some of the conditions include control of wildfires, illegal harvesting of forest products, and control of destruction of vegetation by wildlife, overgrazing and mining. These conditions are possible with engagement of communities to manage Sasawara Forest Reserve as a Joint Forest Management (JFM) area and at the same time as part of the WMA. The lessons learnt from SFR can be replicated in the corridor and other parts of the country. Details of this matter can be pursued by SNWC and articulated by DW and FBD.

The commitment of support agencies to projects such as SNWC is critical for their implementation. The lack of engagement by some of these entities could result in failure to realize project objectives. The Project Steering Committee was well constituted but members from the central government were passive on attendance except the WD. The forum was important for many purposes, such as developing linkages and synergies with ministries and other agencies, sharing lessons and efficient use of resources. The Division of Environment (DoE) in the Vice President's Office (VPO) was one of the key institutional stakeholders through the PSRP-MKUKUTA project funded by UNDP that should have been proactively involved. The project focuses its intervention on capacity building at district level and local level planning in village and communities. The PSRP-MKUKUTA project still has the opportunity to contribute to some of the activities that require follow up such as capacity building of village governments, CBOs and IGA groups.

Projects that are designed with specific time frames should have the provision for clear exit strategies. The project exit strategy was not clear to most communities like CBOs. The potential for continued support from the SNWPC is also not clearly understood by most community members. The SNWPC will provide vehicles but not fuel and will not pay night out allowances to VGS when they conduct patrols. These conditions would have worked well if the CBOs had attained AA status and user rights whereby income would be accrued from hunting and other economic activities. In the absence of this opportunity, the WD should consider to provide the software packages that were in SNWCP while expediting the process of gazeting CBOs as AA and issuing them user rights in their WMAs. Other entities which can be brought in to implement the exit strategy are the Division of Tourism in MNRT to offer advisory services and capacity building on development and management of responsible tourism, Tanzania Tourism Board to promote tourism in the WMAs and the private sector to invest in the area both in consumptive and non consumptive natural resource utilization. Initial contacts established with these entities by the project will need to be followed up in the post-project period.

As projects such as SNWC are implemented, their spheres of influence can expand beyond originally intended boundaries. Today there are villages that are expressing interest in being included in the WMA because of their close proximity to the project. This is a positive project spin off deserving attention by the SNWC together with WD. If this interest is ignored the communities in these villages could frustrate the achievements made by SNWC through engaging in or facilitating poaching, starting wildfires and encroachment into the corridor area.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

The Development and Management of the Selous-Niassa Wildlife corridor project has been under implementation since July 2005. The project purpose is to promote

the conservation of the natural resources in the corridor through a community based approach. The conservation of the corridor is predicated upon the improvement of the capacities of the residents in the area and the realization of direct benefits by these same communities. The project purpose is in line with both Government of Tanzania and UNDP objectives of protection of biodiversity.

Since inception, the project has focused on building the capacities of community groups in twelve villages in the south of the corridor to facilitate their engagement in conservation initiatives as has been happening in the north of the corridor over the past ten years. Improved capacity will equip these community groups with the necessary skills to manage the WMAs that are proposed for the area.

Progress has been recorded in the area of training and capacity building with more than 800 villagers having received training in various aspects of conservation from the project. In addition, 144 village game scouts have been trained and equipped to monitor resource use in the corridor and patrol the area to monitor illegal off-takes of resources. As a result of this training community awareness about the overall objectives of the project is high in the project area.

While no WMAs have been established in the project area, the project has embarked on training that prepares community groups for embarking upon the process of establishing and managing these entities. In addition, business entrepreneurial training has also been provided to prepare communities for managing business activities that have been suggested. These include tourism, bee keeping and fish farming. A major threat to the process of establishing WMAs is the prevailing legal environment especially with reference to wildlife management. Although the law provides for devolution of authority over wildlife resources to community groups, a high degree of control over the resources is still held by government through the Wildlife Division while the process to get WMAs legally designated is long and complicated. The transaction costs of establishing these WMAs have been estimated at US\$ 150000. Furthermore those AAs that are legally established and have received the user rights still do not receive the benefits. There is no official benefit sharing formula from hunting tourism yet in place. The Wildlife Division has indicated their willingness to assist communities with acquiring AA status through training and capacity building. They point to the fact that eight WMAs have now been certified around the country as evidence of their commitment to the programme. It is understandable that the DW is concerned about doing things correctly and ensuring that the process of devolution of control over resources to community groups is done in terms of the law. This does not however require that the processes that are put in place to facilitate this are impossible for communities to follow.

Overall, the evaluation team is of the opinion that the project has achieved most of its intended objectives with the exception of the ones on the conservation of Sasawara Forest the documentation of experiences with the project implementation. The management of Sasawara Forest Reserve will require commitment of personnel

and financial resources by the Division of Forestry and Beekeeping which the Director has now pledged. Although the project has commissioned studies that have contributed to greater understanding of the Selous Niassa wildlife corridor, it has not done much in the way of documenting project experiences. This is an issue that will require attention in the post project phase.

On the issue of project sustainability, the evaluation team is of the view that if the project closes as planned without provision for managing the transitional the gains achieved to date will be lost. There is need therefore for UNDP Tanzania and the Government of Tanzania to consider transitional management and support arrangements to allow for institutionalization of these project gains. Discussions have been initiated with UNDP Tanzania and an agreement has been reached for an additional allocation of US\$ 200,0000 from core resources to cover transitional activities up to December 2009.

The overall rating of the project is “Highly Successful”.

Recommendations

The evaluation team makes the following recommendations for consideration by both UNDP-GEF and the government of Tanzania.

Recommendation 1: The Selous Niassa Wildlife Corridor Development project is as much a rural development project as it is a political process. Efforts need to be made to ensure that the project is located within the political and development processes in the Ruvuma region to ensure that environmental conservation is adequately addressed in overall development planning for the area. Interviews conducted with political leaders such as councilors in some of the wards indicated that these leaders were not formally included in the project implementation processes. The political leadership can help connect the project to on-going initiatives such as the Mtwara Development initiative. Comments on political involvement already given before

Recommendation 2: The government of Tanzania should ensure that the high levels of expectations that have been created through the project are maintained in the post project period through providing continuing financial and technical support to the initiative. The project has received seed funding from UNDP-GEF which has generated a huge groundswell of support for conservation and development among community groups. Financial support could be provided through micro-lending facilities, cooperative support programmes and investments by individuals from within the participating communities

Recommendation 3: The DW should support community groups with the process of registration of WMAs and the acquisition of AA status. It is important that the minimum requirements for devolution of authority for wildlife management to community groups are met. However this process should not take as long as it has taken to date. The procedures for CBOs moving to AA status are all government

processes. DW needs to assist community groups with these processes through training and capacity building. More importantly, DW should assist with ensuring that the technical support services such as legal advisory services, financial planning and registration of WMAs are provided through government entities and not through consultancy services. The division should also negotiate that any costs associated with these services are either waived or at least deferred until community groups can pay them from revenues derived from resource use. This way government will be seen to be contributing to community development.

Recommendation 4: UNDP-GEF and the government of Tanzania should consider continuing to support the SNWC project through the provision of technical assistance to ensure that the nascent projects that have been initiated do not collapse after project closure. Beekeeping and fish farming have only just been introduced into the project area among few community members and might not survive a sudden loss of support. The fisheries management on the Ruvuma River has recently been re-organized with the establishment of up to eighteen fisher groups. This process still needs support and cooperation with the fisheries section of the district. The current Project Manager seconded to the project by government should be facilitated to stay beyond project closure and work with these community groups for at least with the proviso that a new institutional framework for continuing with the project is identified to continue with supporting project implementation. This period should be used as a transitioning period from one funding arrangement to another.

Recommendation 5: Community groups that have embarked upon small enterprises with donor support should be introduced to organizations such as COCOBA for them to access independent funding for their operations. As described before promotion of SACCOs banks This will reduce dependency on donor organizations for funding and promote the spirit of self reliance.

Recommendation 6: Government should facilitate the exploitation of all the opportunities that are available for communities to access funding from global processes such as climate change mitigation through the enlistment of initiatives such as SNWC in carbon trading. This would be made possible through the recognition of the potential for carbon sequestration provided by a well preserved miombo woodland ecosystem. The REDD programme of the government of Tanzania could be used as the vehicle for this.

Recommendation 7: Government of Tanzania should formally engage the government of Mozambique and suggest the establishment of a Transfrontier Conservation Area (TFCA) encompassing Selous Game Reserve, Niassa game Reserve and the corridor between them. The designation of the TFCA would facilitate the introduction of common management systems throughout this elephant range and provide an enlarged scope for attracting conservation and development funding. Consideration could also be given to declare the area a World Heritage Site.

Recommendation 8: Opportunities for continued technical and financial support under other on-going programmes supported by UNDP in Tanzania should be assessed and promoted. UNDP currently supports programmes such as the Joint Programme on Environment and Integrating Environment into MKUKUTA which could be used as vehicles to continue with the work that SNWC was doing.

Recommendation 9: The project has conducted a comprehensive tourism potential study for the corridor. In addition, tourism development zones have been identified as part of the land use and resource management zoning plans that have been developed. When these plans are approved it is recommended that efforts be made to attract the private sector to invest in these areas to promote tourism that involves community groups. Additional potential for the involvement of the private sector are in the processing and marketing of wild honey and its by-products and wild mushrooms.

1.0 Introduction

The Development and Management of the Selous-Niassa Wildlife Corridor Project is a National Executed Project aimed at establishing a viable wildlife corridor between Selous and Niassa Game Reserves in Tanzania and Mozambique respectively through the conservation of the natural resources in the area and development of a network of village-level Wildlife Management Areas (WMA's). The establishment of WMAs is provided for by Tanzania's Wildlife Policy of 1998 and the latest Wildlife Policy of 2007.

The corridor and the biological resources in it are under threat from land clearing for arable use as well as unauthorized wildlife off-takes for local consumption and poaching for ivory at a trans-boundary scale. There is also habitat degradation in the corridor due to uncontrolled and destructive late season wildfires caused by the local population.

The overall purpose of the project is the long-term conservation by communities of species and biological diversity of the miombo forest ecosystem between the protected areas of northern Mozambique and southern Tanzania. This will be achieved through the formation of village-level WMAs the establishment of which will result in the creation of one of the largest protected areas in southern Africa.

The project, building on experiences from the northern area of the corridor where the German Technical Cooperation (GTZ) have been implementing similar initiatives over the past twelve years, will provide further lessons in the challenges and opportunities of establishing WMAs as provided for in the Wildlife Policy of Tanzania (WPT). Lessons learnt will be widely disseminated to facilitate the replication of similar community-based conservation initiatives throughout Tanzania thereby contributing to the establishment of a national system of community managed protected areas. These lessons will also be useful for promoting similar initiatives beyond the country's borders.

1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

This report documents the results of a Terminal Evaluation of the Development and Management of the Selous-Niassa Wildlife Corridor project. The overall objective of the Evaluation was:

“to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the Selous – Niassa Wildlife Corridor project by assessing its project design, the process of implementation and results and outputs vis-à-vis project objectives endorsed by the GEF and other partners (Government UNDP, KfW) including the agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation.”

The Terminal Evaluation was conducted through the performance of the following tasks:

- Assess overall performance and review progress towards attaining the

project's objectives and results including relevancy, efficiency and effectiveness of the actions taken given the available funding and capacities for implementation.

- Review and evaluate the extent to which the project outputs and outcomes have been achieved, and the shortcomings in reaching project objectives as stated in the project document.
- Assess the project results and determine the extent to which the project objective was achieved, or is expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to any positive or negative consequences.
- Assess the extent at which the project impacts have reached or have the potential to reach the intended beneficiaries; in particular, the balance between conservation and livelihood actions spearheaded through the project.
- Critically analyze the implementation arrangements and identify strengths and weaknesses in the project design and implementation
- Describe the project's adaptive management strategy – how have project activities changed in response to new conditions, (e.g. recommendations of the MTE) and have the changes been appropriate in particular the issue of capacity;
- Assess the project's contribution to the GEF Strategic Priority for catalyzing sustainability of Protected Areas (PAs) in particular improving opportunities for sustainable use, benefit sharing and broad stakeholder's participation among communities.
- Review the clarity of roles and responsibilities of the various agencies and institutions and the level of coordination between relevant players. In particular look at the roles of the Project team, district authorities, and MNRT.
- Assess the level of stakeholder involvement in the project from community to higher Government levels and recommend on whether this involvement has been appropriate to the goals of the project.
- Describe and assess efforts of UNDP (CO and UNDP-GEF) in support of the implementation.
- Review donor partnership processes, and the contribution of co-finance.
- Describe key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects for sustainability of project results achieved. Assess the likelihood of continuation of project activities/results, outcomes/benefits after completion of GEF funding, considering the "traditional" economic activities in which these communities are involved.
- Identify and document the main successes, challenges and lessons that have emerged in terms of:

h) Strengthening country ownership, initiative and leadership;

- i) Community level assessment and stakeholder participation at all stages of the project cycle;*
- j) Communication approaches and strategies and their impact on behavioral changes and raising awareness at all levels – both in country, regionally and internationally.*
- k) Application of adaptive management strategies;*
- l) National cooperation, intra governmental cooperation and other project management initiatives*
- m) Efforts to secure sustainability; (see the new GEF format for assessment of sustainability)*
- n) Role of M&E in project implementation as required by GEF guidelines.*

1.2 Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation was conducted over a twenty (20) day period between June 15 and July 15 2009 a two person consulting team comprising an internationally recruited consultant and a national consultant. The evaluation process included:

- the review of project related documents;
- interviews with policy makers and project managers at various levels;
- field visits, and interviews with stakeholders including project beneficiaries.

The consulting team reviewed national legislation and policies relating to development planning, wildlife conservation and environmental protection in order to obtain an understanding of the context within which the project was being implemented. At the project level, the team reviewed the project document, progress reports, financial management and audit reports, and back-to-mission reports which provided information on project implementation progress. The German Development Bank (KfW) is supporting a Selous Niassa Wildlife Protection Corridor Project that is primarily aimed at developing wildlife management infrastructure in the corridor. Programme documents from this initiative were also reviewed to glean lessons from the experience with their implementation. A specific interest in doing this was to establish the possibility of on-going support to the activities that have been supported under the SNWC project being continued under these new initiatives.

Interviews were also conducted with policy makers in the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Department of Wildlife, the Department of Environment and at UNDP. At the project level interviews were conducted with the Regional Commissioner, and the Acting Regional Administrative Secretary Ruvuma Region, the District Commissioner, District Administrative Secretary and District Executive Directors in Namtumbo and Tunduru Districts to obtain their views on the project. In

addition, members of the District Natural Resources Advisory Boards in the two districts were also interviewed.

Field visits were conducted to project sites in the two districts during which consultations were held with community representatives and other stakeholders to establish the impact the project was having on these potential beneficiaries. Project Management and District Council staff in the two districts also provided input into the assessment of project progress and impact.

Briefing sessions were held with regional stakeholders in Ruvuma region and with management at UNDP Country Office at the end of the data gathering process under the evaluation.

The evaluation was based on the GEF Project Review Criteria and looked at the following elements:

- a) Implementation approach;
- b) Country ownership/Driveness;
- c) Stakeholder participation/ Public Involvement;
- d) Sustainability;
- e) Replication approach;
- f) Financial planning;
- g) Cost-effectiveness;
- h) Monitoring and evaluation.

1.3. Structure of the report

A brief Executive Summary covering major findings of the evaluation is given at the beginning of this report. This is followed by Chapter 1 which provides background and context to the project and describes the objectives of the terminal evaluation.

Chapter 2 provides an assessment of the project concept and design, objectives and activities. This also includes a discussion of any design changes that were implemented since the mid-term evaluation and how these have assisted with the realization of project objectives.

Chapter 3 describes project implementation arrangements and covers institutional arrangements, financial management as well as stakeholder participation.

Chapter 4 analyses projects outputs. Each project component is evaluated for the results or outputs it has produced. These are then measured against agreed to indicators and targets.

The project impacts and sustainability are analyzed in Chapter 5 which is followed by an assessment of Lessons Learnt in Chapter 6 and Conclusions and Recommendations in Chapter 7.

Chapter 8 shows the reference material used in compiling this report.

Finally a list of Annexes is attached. These include the Project Logframe as amended, Revised Indicators and Targets, Terms of Reference, List of people interviewed and an Itinerary for the evaluation.

2.0 Project Concept and Design

2.1 Background

Tanzania has an established network of protected areas (PAs) covering an estimated 25% of the country's land surface area. These PAs are used as a basis for conserving the country's rich biological diversity, especially its wildlife heritage which provides the basis for a growing tourism industry. Over the years, the country has used the "fines and fences" approach to conservation which has proved unsustainable as it marginalized community groups that live with the resources. As a result, the resources have increasingly come under increased threats from unauthorized off-takes of wildlife and transboundary poaching of flagship species such as elephant in areas adjacent to international borders. Areas outside protected areas with viable populations of wildlife and other resources have also been affected by wild fires and increased human encroachment through clearance of land for agricultural purposes.



Fig 1: *Use of fire to clear land for agriculture*

To address the problems highlighted above, the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania (GoT) is promoting the concept of community participation in conservation programmes. This concept, which has been tested in other parts of East Africa as well as southern Africa, is predicated upon the understanding that community groups that bear the cost of living with natural resources will more readily be involved in conservation if they realize direct benefits from their efforts. The Wildlife, Forestry and Fisheries Policies developed in 1998 all promote the devolution of management responsibilities over resources to local communities. The Wildlife Policy provides for the establishment of Wildlife Management Areas through which community groups are expected to directly benefit from wildlife utilization schemes. The Policy also promotes transboundary collaboration in wildlife and ecosystems management. In addition to being recognized through the Policy, WMAs are also recognized through the Wildlife Bill that is soon to be enacted by Parliament. This new class of protected area has been promoted for some time in the buffer zone to the south of Selous Game Reserve and is planned for another sixteen areas around Tanzania. These areas will complement the formal protected areas thereby increasing the area of land under protection in the country. As the sustainable utilization of resources by communities is allowed in WMAs, the benefits from biodiversity conservation are expected to expand livelihood options available to such communities which will directly impact on poverty levels. This will bring wildlife management in synchrony with other national programmes aimed at promoting economic growth and reducing poverty in Tanzania as articulated in the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP) or *Mkakati wa Kukuza Uchumi na Kuondoka Umaskini Tanzania (MKUKUTA)*. One of the outcomes stated

in this strategy is “Increased contributions from wildlife, forestry, and fisheries, to incomes of rural communities.” Further, such approaches will promote the attainment of relevant Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), in particular Goals 1 (Eradicate Extreme Poverty) and 7 (Ensure Environmental Sustainability).

2.2 The Project and its development context

2.2.1 Project start and its duration

The Development and Management of Selous-Niassa Wildlife Corridor Project (SNWCP), funded by UNDP-GEF is a four (4) year Medium Sized Project. The project document was signed by all parties in March 2005 and implementation activities started in July 2005. The effective due date was 30 April 2009 but the project was granted a three months no cost extension to 31 July 2009.

The project is executed by the Government of United Republic of Tanzania and implemented by the Wildlife Division (WD) of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT) through a contract agreement with Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Technische Zusammenarbeit International Service (GTZ-IS). The total project budget is US\$ 2,046,500 including US\$ 160,000 input from the Government of United Republic of Tanzania but excluding an initial PDF grant of US\$ 13,500 spent in the project formulation.

2.2.2 Problems that the project seeks to address

The Selous-Niassa Wildlife Corridor is a biodiversity rich landscape in the Miombo woodland ecosystem that connects two of the largest game reserves in Africa, Selous Game Reserve (50,000 Km²) and Niassa Game reserve (42,000 Km²) in Tanzania and Mozambique respectively. The corridor is a significant habitat area for elephants that move between the two game reserves. Also the corridor is of specific national importance as a key part of the “Mtwara-Ruvuma Corridor Development Zone” for which tourism opportunity and sustainable natural resources conservation and management are of a major development component.

The ecosystem viability of the corridor is being threatened by high incidences of both localized and trans-boundary poaching for supply of meat at community level and ivory for international markets. The area also suffers from habitat degradation due to lack of land use plans, uncontrolled land clearance mostly due to shifting cultivation and destructive wildfires caused by the local population. While the corridor ecosystem is under anthropogenic threats, the people themselves are not benefiting much from the current status of the area. The corridor is located in Tunduru and Namtumbo districts of Ruvuma region which are widely recognized as some of the poorest districts in the country but rich in wildlife and forest resources. The corridor has the potential to be an economic boom and not a bane as it is at the current situation. The deterioration of resource management in the corridor has been

exacerbated by the open access system of management which is characterised by lack of control and ownership of resources.

2.2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project

The project goal is to introduce and secure a wide scale adoption of the Wildlife Management Areas Initiative throughout the country that increases area of land under biodiversity conservation. The project purpose is to make sure that biodiversity and habitat are conserved in the globally significant Selous-Niassa miombo forest corridor of Tanzania. The immediate and development objectives of the project are twofold; first the Selous-Niassa Wildlife Corridor is secured by establishing management systems that promote community participation in conservation, and second the benefits from wildlife management enhance the livelihood security of villages with Wildlife Management Area (WMA) in process, and promote the long-term conservation of the corridor. In order to achieve these objectives, the project has focused on building the capacities of community groups in the twelve villages in the south of the corridor to facilitate their engagement in conservation initiatives. Improved capacity will equip these community groups with the necessary skills to manage the WMAs that are proposed in the corridor area. It is expected that through the establishment of WMAs, local communities will participate in active planning, protection and management of these areas. Effective community participation will also result in these communities realizing substantial benefits from wildlife management for their own development. This should provide incentives for improved conservation in the area.

The project was mandated with the following two immediate objectives:

- a) To ensure that the Selous-Niassa Wildlife Corridor is effectively conserved, with the establishment of a network of village wildlife management areas that are protected, managed and utilized in a sustainable manner by the local communities with the assistance of Local Government and Wildlife Division.
- b) To ensure that benefits from wildlife management enhance the livelihood security of villages with WMAs, and promote the long-term conservation of the corridor.

The following five programmatic outcomes are expected at the end of the project:

- i) Greater awareness and capacities for conservation of biodiversity and natural resources within the corridor among communities, local and district authorities;
- ii) Reliable ecological and socio-economic databases for the corridor to serve as decision-making tools for communities and local authorities established;
- iii) A network of WMAs effectively established and managed throughout the corridor;
- iv) The Sasawara Forest Reserve protected through community participation;

v) Best practices for community managed protected areas disseminated.

A set of indicators were developed for use in measuring progress towards achieving the stated objective and outputs. (Annex 1: Project Logframe).

Lessons generated from this experience will be documented for dissemination and possible replication in other areas of Tanzania where similar programmes are being implemented. The project concept therefore addresses a central aspect of development affecting poor rural communities in the Selous-Niassa Corridor as well as in those parts of East and southern Africa that depend on biodiversity resources for their survival.

2.3 Project Design

The project purpose is the promotion of the long term conservation of species and genetic biodiversity of the Miombo forest ecosystem in the areas outside Protected Areas in southern Tanzania and northern Mozambique by re-establishing a viable wildlife corridor.

The overall project objective was stated as: "The Selous-Niassa Wildlife Corridor is effectively conserved, with the establishment of a network of village wildlife management areas that are protected, managed and utilized sustainably by the local communities with the assistance of the Local Government administrative network and the Wildlife Division. As stated above, the project was in line with the national agenda for poverty alleviation.

At the global level, the project responds to the GEF Operational Strategy, and the Operational Programme on Forests, in the Biodiversity Focal Area. In particular, it addresses the guidelines for sustainable use of forests by combining production, socio-economic, and biodiversity goals. It is in accordance with the guidance of the Fourth Conference of Parties of the CBD on: a) access, fair and equitable sharing of benefits that are derived from research and development on biodiversity; b) capacity building at local level to involve communities in biodiversity management and monitoring; c) the importance of indigenous communities in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity as stated by article 8j of the CBD; and d) promoting environmental awareness, and public education. At the regional level, the project links with and benefits from the Southern Africa Biodiversity Programme, a GEF funded initiative aimed at strengthening the capacity of SADC member states to implement provisions of the CBD. As a result of implementing this project, Tanzania was also expected to provide useful lessons to other SADC countries and the global community on the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources.

It is clear therefore that the SNWC project was designed to meet local, national and global conservation and development objectives.

2.4 Project Revision

This Terminal Evaluation was conducted against the backdrop of changes to the project Logframe that were recommended by the mid-Term evaluation that was conducted in 2007. For ease of reference, the following paragraphs are reproduced from the Mid-term review report: *While the project addresses issues that are central to GEF concerns about biodiversity conservation, the opinion of the evaluation team is that the project set itself an overly ambitious target especially at the objective level. Conservation programmes traditionally take a long time to achieve effective results. It was therefore overly ambitious to expect that the corridor would be effectively conserved after four years. In addition, the expectation that a network of WMAs would have been established and “protected, managed and utilized sustainably” by local communities was also raising the bar too high especially given the fact that no WMAs had been established in other parts of the country and especially in the northern sector of the corridor despite GTZ having been engaged in the process through the Selous Conservation Programme (SCP) for close to ten years prior to the launching of the SNWC initiative. Many of the indicators developed for both the objective level and the output level were also considered to be not objective and easily quantifiable and in some cases had little relevance to the outputs they were supposed to track. (There was actually only one!) Some of the Output statements were also considered to be unclear. The evaluation team has suggested changes to some of the protect Output and Indicator statements which they believe will assist with the process of tracking progress.*

An additional observation by the evaluation team was that the project design did not incorporate mid-term targets and only specifies end of project targets. Measurement of progress at mid-term was therefore conducted against this end of project targets which made it extremely difficult to objectively assess the progress the project has made to date. To facilitate assessment of what has happened to date, the evaluation team conducted a qualitative assessment of project outputs to date and established the results that have been achieved. These are presented as a baseline that can now be used to evaluate the appropriateness of the original end-of-project targets. All the suggested changes to the objective statement, the Output statements and performance indicators are presented in Annex 5. All project management entities (MNRT, UNDP, Project Management Team and District Councils) will need to sit together to review the recommended changes and refocus the project towards what can reasonably be achieved by December 2008. The project team might also need to consider the time lost at project initiation and decide whether there is need to request for a no cost extension of the project beyond December 2008. This decision will be dependent upon the availability of financial resources.

The Terminal Evaluation team observed that management decisions had been taken to factor these recommendations into project implementation strategies over the period 2007 to 2009. The TE was therefore conducted to measure progress against objective statements and indicators agreed to following the MTE.

2.5 Project Budget/Financial Planning

The total project budget was US\$ 2,260,000. This was made up of GEF contributions, co-financing and government contributions. The GEF direct payment component totaled S\$ 986, 500 as well as PDF grant of US\$ 13,500 used for project identification. UNDP also contributed an additional US\$ 200,000 to support community based activities to support project implementation to the end of 2009. Government contribution totaled US\$ 160,000 over the life of the project while co-financing amounted to US\$ 1,060,000.

The following elements of co-financing were secured for various aspects of project implementation over the project life span:

The project SCP/GTZ was being phased out as the SNWC project started, and the IZW/GTZ Wildlife Research component continued into 2005.

The project CWM/GTZ continued to assist with the WMA establishment in the northern part of the Selous - Niassa Wildlife Corridor and was phased out in December 2005

New project partners are the German Development Bank, KfW which started its implementation phase in 2007. The Swiss NGO ADAP will started operations in July 2006 with a bee-keeping component in the northern part of the corridor and will extend the project activities to the southern part of the corridor in a second phase.

UNDP Small Grants Programme supported income generating projects in bee-keeping and fish farming following the recommendation of the MTE.

The German institution InWent, Capacity Building International, facilitated the cross-border dialogue with Mozambique in the context of the Ruvuma River Basin management initiative. The total committed as co-financing for projects and activities in the corridor amounted to more than US\$ 8 million.

Table 1 Total Project Budget

UNDP Direct Financing	
UND/GEF	US\$ 986,500
PDFA	US\$ 13,500
UNDP Core funding	US\$ 200,000
Sub-Total	US\$ 1,200,000
Co-financing	
GTZ/SCP:	US\$ 500,000

CWM GTZ	US\$ 200,000
German Development Bank (KfW)	US\$ 6,500,000
IZW/GTZ:	US\$ 340,000
Government contribution	US\$ 160,000
UNDP/SGP	US\$ 60,000
ADAP	US\$ 250,000
InWent	US\$ 60,000
Sub-Total (Co-financing)	US\$ 8,070,000
Grand Total	US\$ 9,270,000

Source: UNDP CDR Reports, 2009 and Project Annual Report 2008

3.0 Findings and Conclusions

3.1 Findings

3.1.1 Implementation Roles and Responsibilities

The SNWC project is a NEX project in the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism that is implemented through GTZ-IS who provide Project Management personnel. The project is based at the district level in Namtumbo and Tunduru districts where it is expected to be institutionalized at its completion. Although project implementation was supposed to commence on January 1 2005 following the signing of all enabling documents and protocols, effective implementation only began in July of 2005 due to delays in the recruitment of project personnel. While GTZ-IS managed to identify and recruit a Technical Advisor for the project, the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania and UNDP took a considerable amount of time to recruit an agreed Project Manager. Project implementation only began in earnest in July 2005 following the assumption of duty by the Technical Advisor who then continued to act as Project Manager until the appointment of an Acting Project Manager in September 2006.

Despite these initial mobilization problems and the design issues discussed in the section above, the Technical Advisor initiated project implementation starting with establishing project management structures at various levels. A Project Steering Committee that operates as a policy making body for the project has been set up. The Steering Committee is chaired by the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism and includes the following members:

- The Regional Administrative Secretary for Ruvuma Region;

- The District Commissioners-Namtumbo and Tunduru;
- The District Executive Directors of Namtumbo and Tunduru;
- A representative from the Department of Wildlife;
- Representation from the Divisions of Forestry and Beekeeping-Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism;
- The District Council chairpersons from Namtumbo and Tunduru;
- Representative of Sokoine University of Agriculture, Morogoro
- Tanzania Ministry of Finance representative;
- The Members of Parliament for the two constituencies/districts (Namtumbo and Tunduru)
- The GEF Focal Point for Tanzania;
- UNDP Country Office Representative;
- UNDP GEF Coordinating Unit, and
- A representative of GTZ-IS/GTZ-CBC
- Representatives of Community Based Organizations in the project area.
- Representative from Likuyu Training Centre

The Project Manager and the Technical Advisor provided secretariat services to the Steering Committee.

UNDP and GEF provided on-going monitoring of project implementation through periodic visits to the project site. At least three visits were conducted to the project since the MTE. As was established at the time of the MTE, while the project was intended to deliver on five programmatic outputs, implementation primarily focused on capacity building, awareness raising and establishing a baseline on the social, economic and ecological situation in the project area (Outcomes 1.2.3). These aspects of the project were considered necessary precursors to other aspects such as the establishment of WMAs, and the development and packaging of best practices. The expectation that these last two programme areas would form the main focus of the project in the last two years has not generally been met. The programme to support the conservation of the Sasawara Forest Reserve has also not recorded positive results. The expectation had always been that the KfW project was to assume greater responsibility for this activity but there were problems experienced with engaging with the Division of Forestry and Beekeeping to demarcate the boundaries of the forest reserve. There is commitment to this initiative by DFB and it is expected that greater progress will be achieved with this result area as the KfW project unfolds.

3.1.2 Stakeholder Participation

The SNWCP is a community and grass root centred initiative that seeks to engage local communities in the conservation of wildlife in the corridor area so that they can enjoy the benefits of these conservation efforts. The evaluation established that the local communities are effectively involved in the implementation and management of

the project. Community level institutions such as village natural resources management committees and community based organisations have been set up for the management of the project. These have been formally registered with government turning them into legal entities (See Kimbanda Certificate of Registration). These entities include a representation of women in very senior positions.

The project administrative operations are based at the district level in Namtumbo and Tunduru districts, while the project activities are implemented in twelve villages and the primary stakeholders are the local communities in the corridors area. The three (3) Community Based Organisations (CBOs) are key stakeholders because they have the mandate on behalf of other villagers in the twelve villages, to manage the WMAs and administer the user rights in the WMAs when they are gazetted as Authorised Associations. The other important stakeholders at the community level are community groups that are involved in income generating activities (IGAs) that are responsibly linked to natural resources conservation, village governments which are the custodian of village land and resources therein, Village Natural Resource Management Committees (VNRMC), farmers, households and individuals that derive their livelihood support from the corridor area.

From the very beginning, the project ensured that stakeholders that had an influence on the development and implementation of activities in the area were involved in the process. The support of the political leadership in the area starting with traditional leaders through the village, ward, and district to the regional and national leadership was enlisted through their inclusion in project management structures at these various levels. As a result, decision making bodies such as the Project Steering Committee include representatives of the political leadership in the area. It has therefore been easy for the project to attract attention from these stakeholders when it was required. An important dimension of stakeholder participation that the project introduced was the involvement of stakeholders from across the border in Mozambique. This was in recognition of the transboundary nature of the project. Bilateral meetings have been organised with these stakeholders to discuss issues of mutual interest. The evaluation recommends that this be followed up with the establishment of a Transfrontier Conservation Area.

The secondary stakeholders interested in the ecosystem viability and sustained economic development of the corridor area are many but most important are the district councils, regional administration, WD and Forestry and Beekeeping Divisions (FBD)) in MNRT, conservation and development NGOs and private sector interested in investment in the area. These stakeholders have been brought in to participate in project management and implementation as a matter of course.

At a global scale, the SNWC Project has engaged with a variety of stakeholders through publications and presentations at various international fora which has exposed the project to a wide audience. The spread of these presentations is

indicated in the results table of this report. This exposure culminated in the project winning the CIC award in 2008. .

THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

FORM SA. 3



The Societies (Application for Registration) Rules 1954

(Rule 5)

CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION
NUMBER SA. 16371

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT **KIMBANDA WILDLIFE CONSERVATION COMMUNITY BASED ORGANISATION** has this day been registered under the Societies Act **CAP.337 R.E.2002.**

Dated this **27th day of March, 2009.**


AUGUSTINE D. SHIO
AG: Registrar of Societies
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

DSM ---- Tanzania



3.1.3 Replication Approach

The Development and Management of the Selous Niassa Wildlife Corridor Project has generated a lot of information which is proving to be valuable for decision making in the corridor. The focus on awareness building, benefit sharing and capacity building is important for replication of the activity in other areas planning to embark on similar initiatives. In addition, the attention paid to development of linkages with larger development planning initiatives such as the Mtwara Development Corridor Initiative will in the long run assist with placing conservation initiatives into the larger development planning context. This can be replicated elsewhere in the country and further afield.

3.1.4 Cost Effectiveness

As stated in the MTE report, awareness raising and capacity building are labour intensive and iterative processes that consume large amounts of financial resources. The project has spent a large amount of money on this aspect of project implementation resulting in the establishment of twelve new village natural resources committees and three CBOs in the project area. Due to this, community groups are ready to engage in activities that will bring about direct benefits to themselves and to biodiversity conservation in the corridor.

Data gathering has also been a focus of the project over the past four years due to the realization that data and information are critical inputs into effective decision-making. The project website is a rich source of information on the Selous Niassa Corridor which has become useful for district and regional level planning. Although, the project has not established any WMAs as yet, considerable effort has been put into preparing the communities for this aspect of the project through training. The communities involved in the project also participate in WMA discussions with other groups involved in similar activities. This involvement has resulted in the creation of a network of WMA initiatives through which these communities have gained from the experiences of others.

The overall assessment of the evaluation team is that project finances have been effectively deployed resulting in increased capacities for project implementation in the twelve participating villages. It is expected that with the creation of the requisite enabling environment these communities will be able to effectively engage in the process of establishing and certifying WMAs in their areas. The Wildlife Division has expressed the willingness to assist with these processes.

3.1.5 Linkages with other Interventions in the sector

SNWC has been implemented in an environment where Tanzania is already implementing other projects that target poverty alleviation and biodiversity

conservation. The overall Government of Tanzania Poverty Reduction Strategy is articulated in the MKUKUTA documents. The Vice President's Office (VPO) as the coordinating office for environmental management also has programmes aimed at enhancing local level capacities for environmental management and planning and integrating these planning processes into local planning initiatives. SNWC should be integrated into this initiative for sustainability past UNDP-GEF project support. The Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism has a national strategy for environmental management which covers the wildlife and forestry sectors. The project addresses issues of concern to both these sectors. It is therefore important that the two divisions work closely together to promote the goals articulated by the project. In this context, an important consideration is the link between biodiversity conservation and climate change mitigation. The REDD project housed in the Ministry is an important link with this project.

The German Development Bank is supporting the Selous Niassa Wildlife Corridor protection project that is focussed on the development of wildlife management infrastructure in the corridor. This project provides perhaps the best opportunity for continuing with elements of SNWC that still require further work. Close linkages have been developed between the projects but they need to be formalised with even the provision that UNDP-GEF and KfW sign memoranda of understanding to facilitate passing on of some initiatives after the closure of the GEF project. The Government Project Manager on the GEF project could also transition to join the KfW team so as to ensure that the projects that are currently on-going under the UNDP support are carried on beyond July 2009. Elements of this project that could be carried over under such an arrangement are discussed under the section of this report that deals with project sustainability.

3.1.6 Project Implementation

The project has been implemented through very effective structures which included the Project Management Team at Namtumbo. The appointment of a Project Manager from government ensured that the project would be institutionalised into government management systems. Evidence of this was clear in the two districts as well as at the Regional level where government entities responsible for rural development and environment now operate as project implementation teams. The two districts of Namtumbo and Tunduru have also adopted the project as one of their planning activities and now factor it into their Strategic Plans. Tunduru District has budgeted Tsh 10 million per year for the next three years for support to SNWC project activities. It is clear therefore that project delivery will continue past the end of support from UNDP-GEF as the project is now being taken as part of the on-going district level planning activities.

Financial management responsibility under the project rested with the Project Management Team working closely with the UNDP Country Office. Management arrangements within the project Management Team adhere to the principles of segregation of responsibilities which provides for checking of processes by different

responsible officers along the approval chain. These checks and balances provide for accountable management systems. The project has produced financial reports on schedule and has been audited as per UNDP-GEF requirements with no adverse reports received over its life span.

An effective project monitoring and evaluation system has been implemented throughout the life of the project. Progress reports have been produced on schedule while UNDP Tanzania and the GEF Regional Office have also conducted periodic monitoring as required.

An issue of concern to the evaluators is that the project timeframe was limited. Conservation projects take a long time to yield results. This is more so when they include programmes to change mindsets. So far the SNWC project has mobilised community participation in this complex initiative. There is need to ensure that the level of interest and commitment to the initiative that has been generated is not lost when the UNDP support to the project comes to an end. The evaluation team could not identify an exit strategy for the project management team, a situation which could be a potential threat to project sustainability. Specific recommendations are made in this report with specific regards to this aspect of project management and coordination.

3.1.7 Monitoring and Evaluation

The project has an elaborate Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (MEP) to track project performance and achievement of results. The MEP is divided into four (4) components namely (i) reporting on the implementation of action and operation plans of the project through annual, periodic and technical reports, (ii) monitoring and evaluation on the performance of the project that comprise policy level meetings, midterm and final evaluations (iii) regular Monitoring and Evaluation conducted by UNDP Country Office and (iv) learning and knowledge sharing which involves sharing and communicating lessons learnt that may be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. All the components are built in the project design and internally implemented except the midterm and terminal evaluations that are conducted by external evaluators. The terminal evaluation team had access to most of internally generated monitoring and evaluation reports and paid attention on annual and technical reports.

4.0 Results to Date

This section of the report discusses the achievements that the project has realised since the mid-term review in 2007. The mid-term evaluation made recommendations that significantly guided the project in the execution of its operations in the remaining

period. It introduced baseline data in most of the outputs where it was absent and recast some of the overly ambitious planned outputs.

A variety of natural resources management systems have been put in place involving the community groups in the twelve participating villages. In all, up to 3000 square kilometres of the corridor has been set aside for wildlife conservation while resource use zones and land use plans are now being developed for this area with support from both the SNWC project and the SNWPC project. In order to ensure that these planning initiatives are sustainable into the future the project has invested in capacity building activities through which members of natural resources management committees from all twelve villages have received training in various aspects of conservation including the formulation of resource use plans. Community groups have also been organised into community based organisations that are the first stage in the creation of institutions with the requisite authority to manage resources under the law in Tanzania. The intended result of the introduction of these management systems is an improvement in wildlife populations in the corridor. The MTE expressed concern that the one-time dry season aerial game census results had showed very low wildlife populations compared to the 1998 and 2001 counts. Anecdotal evidence presented by community members indicated that wildlife numbers had increased in the area with some species like zebra being occasionally sighted near homesteads. In addition, crop damage by elephants was also reported to have increased over the last cropping season. Patrol reports of village game scouts also indicated an increase in wildlife numbers, an aspect that has been confirmed by district game rangers. The validity of these statements could be examined and attested if recent animal census were available and compared with baseline data. The upcoming animal census in September/October 2009 will assist with this.

Improved resource use and conservation is influenced by many factors including population growth. The population structure in the corridor is skewed in favour of the youth. This population structure indicates that there will be increasing pressure on the resources as more land is cleared for agriculture. Already there is evidence of this happening in the area especially in those areas where community members grow rice. As more land is cleared for agriculture, there will be increased interference with wildlife movements in the corridor. This is an issue that the SNWCP project will need to address if project sustainability is to be guaranteed.

The MTE raised the concern that communities in the project area were not realising benefits from their participation in the project. The recommendation was made at that time that the project engage with the UNDP-GEF Small Grants Programme to promote Income Generating Activities (IGAs) that would fill the gap until project based benefits started flowing. The project has established these linkages and all twelve villages have community groups engaged in fish farming and beekeeping. Although up to thirty-six (36) bee hives have been delivered to the twelve villages, the beneficiary communities are yet to realise benefits. Individual community

members as well as groups have developed fish ponds in response to the potential market for fish in the project area were demand is currently not being met. The level of interest demonstrated by communities in this activity is so high that the project had not been able to supply all participating community members that have developed fish ponds with fingerlings. A second project phase during which the remainder of participants will be provided with fish stocks has been suggested under the project. If these are not provided by project end measures should be put in place to ensure that these community members obtain the fish stocks they require. If it takes a long time for communities to realise the much awaited benefits, community groups can easily despair and turn against their own conservation efforts that they have already invested in the area.

As stated earlier in this report, the SNWC project aimed to achieve five outputs. With regards to awareness raising, the TE concluded that the project had performed successfully. More than eighty percent (80%) of the community members in the corridor were aware of the project. This was achieved through the extensive training that was conducted for various community groups ranging from village game scouts and natural resources management committee members to CBO members.

Improved community awareness was also achieved through the conduct of exchange visits to areas in Tanzania where similar projects had been implemented. In addition to community level awareness raising the project also promoted visits to the project area by senior government officials from the Regional Offices as well as from Dar-es-Salaam. Finally, in recognition of the linkages between Selous and Niassa Game Reserves, bilateral meetings had also been arranged between Tanzania and Mozambique.

An innovation that was introduced by the project to enhance community awareness was the recording and production of music that highlights the value of the corridor to the local communities and the need for its effective management. The music was performed by the Ushoroba Cultural Group from Namtumbo District. While the music popularises the corridor and its social and economic value, the evaluators were of the opinion that the choice to have it performed by a contracted group of musicians and not the villagers themselves denied the project participants the opportunity to “speak for themselves”. The proposed next phase which is expected to produce video recordings should therefore target the involvement of the villagers themselves in the production. This way, the linkages between the environment and the social and cultural aspects in the area will be better articulated.

Effective conservation in the corridor is dependent upon decision-making processes that require the availability of adequate data and information on the corridor. In response to this the project commissioned various studies and surveys on the biodiversity and socio-economic features of the corridor. In total 7 studies were carried out or commissioned by the project and the results disseminated. This data

and information has been uploaded onto the project website which has been periodically updated during the project lifespan.

The third output area was the creation of wildlife management areas involving the participating communities. While three community based organisations have been set up in the project area, little progress has been made towards the establishment of Wildlife Management Areas. This limited progress is due to the overly onerous conditions that community groups need to satisfy before they can acquire this status. Experience from other parts of Tanzania shows that it takes up to seven years for community groups to acquire AA status from the Wildlife Division. The WD will need to assist community groups with this process if the engagement of these communities in the wildlife corridor processes is to be maintained. The commitment of financial resources to community training in the WMA processes should be implemented without delay.

No progress has been recorded with the participation of community groups in the management of Sasawara Forest Reserve due to the limited participation by the Forestry Department in the process not only see also reasons mentioned before which is the delay of the partner organisation in identification of boundaries and little progress has been recorded with regards to documentation of experience with the implementation of the project to date. The achievements of the project to date are recorded in the table below.

Table 2: Project Achievements against Objective

<p>Project Objective</p>	<p>The Selous-Niassa Wildlife Corridor is secured by establishing management systems that promote community participation in conservation.</p> <p>Benefits from wildlife management enhance the livelihood security of villages with WMA in process, and promote the long-term conservation of the corridor.</p>		
<p>Indicator</p>	<p>Target Measure</p>	<p>Terminal Evaluation Findings</p>	<p>Achievement Rating</p>
<p>Indicator 1: By the end of the project 3000 km² of land within the project area of the southern corridor is protected for conservation purposes through the Wildlife Management Area (WMA) initiative and the required applications for three interlinked WMAs are forwarded to the Director of Wildlife for approval.</p>	<p>3,000 ha of land in the corridor is protected for conservation</p>	<p>CBOs in Mbarang'andu and Nalika WMAs have attained Authorized Association (AA) status and qualified to statutory share of revenue collected from tourism hunting. (The two AA were not fully part of the SNWCP but benefited from the project by being members of the Project Steering Committee (PSC). They also inspired the project CBOs)</p> <p>4178 km² land has been set aside for WMAs, which are also interlinked, during the land-use plan.</p> <p>Village land survey and land-use planning is being carried out under the SNWPC/KfW project through the second half of 2008/2009 financial year. The three (3) CBOs have prepared Resource Zone Management Plans and are in the process of submitting the WMA applications to the DW so that the</p>	<p>S</p>

		CBOs are gazetted as AA. The CBOs are however struggling with this process (Chingoli CBO was still struggling with obtaining final documents such as CVs of Board of Trustee members at the time of the TE) and there is need for a review of these procedures. It is recommended that this issue is pursued by SNWPC with the regional administration)	
Indicator 2: By the end of the project natural resources committees of 12 villages are formed and trained.	12 Village Natural Resources Management Committees formed and trained in 12 villages	Village Natural Resources Management Committees in 12 villages were established and their leaders (in total 54 persons) have been trained in natural resources conservation and management, legislation, administration and management.	HS
Indicator 3: By the end of the project three Community Based Organizations (CBO) with the capacity for the management of WMAs are formed by the 12 villages.	3 CBOs formed for the management of the WMAs in the 12 villages	Three CBOs were formed for the management of WMAs. The formal training of CBO leaders, in total 24 persons, took place at Community Based Conservation Training Centre (CBCTC) at Likuyu. Furthermore training about setting up a CBO, election process, the formulation of the constitutions was carried out during the establishment process with in total 150 participants of all villages. All CBO members participated in	HS

		<p>study tours to Ruaha National Park and MBOMPA WMA and AA to learn about the management of a WMA, conservation, income generation with tourism, crop protection measures.</p> <p>All CBO members were trained in entrepreneurship and business skills.</p>	
<p>Indicator 4: Agricultural activities and settlements do not prevent wildlife movements</p>	<p>No prevention of wildlife movements is caused by settlements and agricultural activities</p>	<p>The removal of illegal settlers is still a persistent problem in Semeni Hamlet. The involvement of the Regional Administration has been enlisted.</p> <p>New cropping lands especially for rice are being opened up in wildlife corridors.</p>	<p>MU</p>
<p>Indicator 5: At least six (6) villages receive an increase in financial or other benefits from natural resources management in the WMAs in process</p>	<p>No financial benefits were identified</p>	<p>WMAs are in the process of being established. Community benefits from wildlife management are still to be realized BUT the project has initiated income generation projects such as aquaculture and bee-keeping in all twelve participating villages through UNDP-SGP support and in cooperation with the KfW project.</p> <p>There is an increase in non financial benefits – village land security with a new certificate of boundaries for village land, land</p>	<p>S</p>

		<p>disputes have been settled, land use plans have been established</p> <p>CBOs have functioning offices.</p> <p>Fisheries management at Ruvuma River has been restructured, Beach management Units established and contracts for the lease of fishing rights between CBOs and Beach Management Units facilitated.</p> <p>All three CBOs received a monetary award from CIC for conservation. performance</p>	
Overall Rating: Project Objective			S

Table 3: Progress against Outcomes

Outcome 1	Greater awareness and capacities for conservation of biodiversity and natural resources within the corridor among communities, local and district authorities.		
Indicator	Target Measure	Terminal Evaluation Findings	Achievement Rating
Indicator 1: At least 50% of households in the local community are aware about the WMA process and conservation of natural resources within SNWC.	50% of households in the corridor area	The project has done much on raising community awareness about the need for and value of the corridor. Various methods of raising awareness have been employed including meetings, resource user groups, and cultural music. According to research carried out in 2008 by P. Picard, a Yale University PhD student, results showed that 74 % of	HS

		community members were aware of the corridor. This exceeds the target of 50% set after the MTE.	
<p>Indicator 2:</p> <p>Exchange visits are undertaken by at least ten community members from each village to WMAs in the northern sector of the corridor by end of year 3</p>	10 members from each village	Eleven (11) members from each village visited WMAs in the northern sector. Therefore a total 132 members visited WMAs. Visits contributed to awareness raising	HS
<p>Indicator 3</p> <p>Annual exchange visits undertaken by village, local and district personnel and CBO leaders to areas with registered WMAs in Tanzania</p>	3 visits undertaken in three years (2007-2009)	<p>One exchange visit carried out by village, local and district authority personnel and councilors in 2007. This study tour included the visit of three Authorized Associations with WMAs and wildlife tourism in the northern part of the Selous Game Reserve.</p> <p>Another 2 visits were conducted in 2008 to MBOMIPA (Matumizi Bora ya Maliasili Idodi and Pawaga) in Iringa Rural District, Iringa region and Ruaha National Park. This was adjudged to be one of the most successful activities implemented by the project. Exchange visits have resulted in a lodge operator expressing interest in bringing tourists to the corridor and establishing a lodge on the Ruvuma River.</p>	HS

<p>Indicator 4 Formal meeting undertaken each year between Wildlife Authorities of Selous-Game Reserve of Tanzania and Niassa Game Reserve of Mozambique</p>	<p>3 meetings undertaken in three years (2007-2008)</p>	<p>Each year meetings were carried out with the last meeting resulting in improved VHF radio communication cross-border and a first joint /parallel patrol along the border. The project facilitated annual meetings between entities in Tanzania and Mozambique. Progress from unofficial meetings and cooperation to a MoU has been achieved while a Selous-Niassa cross border conservation group has been established.</p> <p>The Projects and Law Enforcement Units of both sides are in permanent contact via email and exchange information about cross-border issues.</p> <p>Research has been conducted in cooperation and results exchanged – recommendations of the Ruvuma River study on improvement of the fisheries management at Ruvuma The regional MoU for cross-border cooperation concluded in 2007 in Mtwara was co-financed and received major inputs from the project on conservation and natural resources management issues.</p> <p>In 2006 a first official meeting on</p>	<p>. HS</p>
--	---	---	------------------

		<p>cross border cooperation between Tanzania and Mozambique was held in Maputo and facilitated and co-financed by InWent, Capacity Building International Germany. InWent also facilitated the cooperation with the Ruvuma River Basin Organization under a SADC agreement.</p> <p>In November 2008 the UNDP/GEF project team was an official member of the Tanzanian Delegation to at a meeting convened at the invitation of the Governor of the Niassa Province to discuss progress with cross border cooperation.</p> <p>It is recommended that consideration be given to establishment of Selous-Niassa Trans-Frontier Conservation Area (TFCA) and to promote collaboration between the TFCA and Ruvuma River Basin Organization (This can be pursued through SADC initiatives).</p>	
<p>Indicator 5:</p> <p>Training on land-use planning carried out for at least 80 key persons from district, local government and villages before the start</p>	80 persons trained on land use planning	82 key persons were trained in land-use planning and integrated natural resources and water management in cooperation with InWEnt.	HS

of the land-use plan			
Overall rating: Project Outcome 1			HS
Outcome 2	Information data bases on ecological and socioeconomic environment in the corridor created for use as decision support tools by planning authorities		
Indicator 1: Dynamic ecological and socio-economic data for the management of the corridor collected, processed and disseminated by end of project.	Not quantified	In total 7 studies were carried out or commissioned by the project and disseminated, with the following during reporting time. Potential of wild mushrooms in the Miombo woodlands of the Selous Niassa Wildlife Corridor for the livelihood improvement of the local population. Carried out in cooperation with ADAP, Vegetation study and Provisional Vascular Plant Check List, and Updated Version No. 1. Land Use, Livelihoods and Attitudes in the Selous Niassa Wildlife Corridor. Socio-economic base line study conducted by UNDP/GEF. Aerial census conducted in cooperation with TAWIRI. Ruvuma River Study carried out in cooperation with Niassa National Reserve Responsible Tourism Pre-feasibility study carried out in 2008 Commuter and trading routes in the SNWC Detailed description of each future WMA including culture, socio-economic data, natural heritage ,	S

		biodiversity and management issues available in English and Kiswahili	
Indicator 2: Database ready to be used for decision making by management by end of year 3		Database regularly updated and either available on website or as hardcopy. The data is ready for use by the SNWPP/KfW which is by design a follow up to SNWCP Also available for the districts and WD	HS
Overall Rating: Project Outcome 2			S
Outcome 3	The process for the establishment of a network of WMAs throughout the corridor finalized and application submitted to WD		
Indicator 1 Ten members of the community from each of the 12 target villages trained to implement WMAs after 18 months (1.5yrs)	10 members from 12 villages trained on management of WMAs	An average of 11 members from each of the 12 villages had received training on implementing management of WMAs	HS
Indicator 2. Mapping of boundaries of the WMAs with the participation of 12 target villages facilitated by end of year 4	Boundaries of WMAs with 12 participating villages facilitated	The project did not facilitate the exercise, however, mapping of boundaries has commenced with support from SNWCPC (KfW) Assistance	S
Indicator 3. 12 village scouts of each of the 12 villages trained and equipped for anti-poaching exercises by end of year 2.	120 Village Game Scouts trained	144 village scouts have been trained to date and equipped with two sets of uniforms. The scouts though zealous are however still ill equipped to confront armed poachers.	HS

<p>Indicator 4. At least 1 income generating project in each village based on sustainable utilization of natural resources by</p>	<p>2 income generating projects in each village</p>	<p>Thirty-six (36) bee-hives (three per village) have been delivered to all participating villages to be used for demonstration purposes. All participating villages have also embarked upon fish farming projects with individual households having established fish ponds and received fingerlings. .</p>	<p>S</p>
<p>Indicator 5. Development of WMA management plan/resource use zone plan with the participation of all 12 target villages facilitated by end of year 4.</p>	<p>WMA Resource Use Management Plans facilitated</p>	<p>Project funded the development and management of WMA plans and resource use zones in all 12 villages.</p> <p>Some hitches experienced with establishing boundaries of forest reserves in particular Sasawara Forest Reserve.</p>	<p>S</p>
<p>Indicator 6. 3 CBOs established and registered at end of year 3.</p>	<p>3 CBOs established and registered</p>	<p>3 CBOs were established and registered and are in the formal process of final registration as AA and user rights over wildlife by DW in Dar es Salaam. Each CBO established its own office with material assistance of the project and opened their bank accounts. All three Chingeli CBOs are in advanced process to form their Board of Trustees</p>	<p>HS</p>
<p>Overall Rating: Project Outcome 3</p>			<p>S</p>
<p>Output 4</p>	<p>Communities participate in conservation of Sasawara Forest Reserve.</p>		
<p>Indicator 1. Communities</p>	<p>No measurable targets</p>	<p>Participatory Forestry</p>	

are aware and knowledgeable about principles of Participatory Forest Management at the end of year 3.		Management (PFM) is being practiced in a number of the villages involved in the project but linkages with SNWCP objectives are weak.	
Indicator 2. Joint Management Plan initiated by end of year 4.		Forest boundaries still to be resurveyed even after SNWPC/KfW approached FBD with offers for collaboration in this activity.	
Overall Rating: Project Outcome 4:			Cannot be rated
Outcome 5	Best practice on establishment of WMAs documented and disseminated to influence implementation of national policy		
Indicator 1. Existence of an active network of participants of WMA initiatives by year 2		Networking enhanced through exchange visits but has not been formalized and put in calendar of activities. The project facilitated the distribution of information and the participation of the CBO representatives during the formation of the AA Consortium. Relevant information or news regarding WMA issues were regularly distributed in the entire project area. Participation of CBO representatives during district natural resources advisory body meetings was facilitated by the project.	S
Indicator 2 Participation of		Project staff (Technical Advisor -	

<p>project staff and community representatives in 2 WMA fora annually.</p>		<p>TA and Project Manager- PM) continued to be members of the Tanzania Natural Resources Forum (TNRF). Both the TA and PM participated in fora organized by the MNRT, but due to the enormous distance from the project area to the venue of meetings from e.g. TNRF (mostly held in Arusha, which takes six traveling days to and fro) the staff could not participate and had to use email communication instead. Networking with other organizations implementing WMA projects was permanently carried out and experience exchanged. Including visits from other organizations to the SNWC project area. The participation of 3 CBO representatives in meetings to form a national consortium for all AAs was facilitated</p>	<p>S</p>
<p>Indicator 3 Completed case study of Selous-Niassa WMA experience disseminated to policy leaders of WPT addressing both WMA and system boundary</p>		<p>No progress on this indicator It is an important issue and needs to be done. Different aspects of the work experience have been published – however a summary document has not been finalized because the project continued the implementation of activities pertaining to the WMA process</p>	<p>MU</p>

		until the last day.	
<p>Indicator 4. Present the project and disseminate its WMA process on different level workshops and meetings</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of SNWC at Peace Parks Conference in Canada 2007 with case study: “Connecting the world’s largest elephant ranges” in Peace Parks, Conservation and Conflict Resolution, Ed Saleem Ali, MIT Press September 2007. • Presentation of two papers at Tanzania Wildlife Research Institute (TAWIRI) annual conference in Arusha in 2007: • Biodiversity Values, Threats and Conservation Strategies of the Selous Niassa Wildlife Corridor, Bloesch U. Hahn R. November 2007 • Elephant movements and home range determination using GPS/ARGOS satellites and GIS program: implication to conservation in South Tanzania, Mpanduji D. Ngomello K. November 2007 • Awarded with Markhor Award of CIC at COP 9 of 	HS

		<p>CBD in Bonn. May 2008.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Earth Negotiations Bulletin on the Side ENBOTS, report on side events of the CBD; 2008 Markhor Award, Page 4.• UN World Tourism Organization, WTO, Seminar on Eco-tourism and Protected Areas, Maputo, November 2008, Presentation “Potentials for supply chains to reduce poverty and provide community benefits in the Selous Niassa Wildlife Corridor” Presentation of cross-border cooperation between SNWC and Niassa Reserve during neighborhood meeting of Regions and Provinces at Tanzania Mozambique border in Lichinga, November 2008.• Presentation and promotion of SNWC during International Tourism Bourse Berlin ITB, March 2009 with support from InWent	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Music and brochures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production of local music with cultural group to create awareness and promote conservation. Distribution of CDs and music tapes in villages, pubs local radio stations. Free download from website in internet. Carried out in cooperation with the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC). Music was also introduced at CIC's annual conference in Marrakesh, Morocco, in 2008. • Production of brochures: Selous Niassa Wildlife Corridor – towards trans-frontier conservation. • Foldable brochure: Wild edible mushrooms of the Selous – Niassa Wildlife Corridor <p>Articles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Corridors of Potential” Hahn R. Baldus R. in Africa Geographic Dec 2007/Jan. 2008. • Various articles in Tanzania 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Newspapers and East African, Tanzania Kakakuona Wildlife Magazine, African Indaba, German, Spanish, Argentina hunting magazines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SNWC in Wildlife Corridors in Tanzania, Tanzania Wildlife Research Institute, January 2009. • The Selous – Niassa Wildlife Corridor, Hahn R. Baldus R. in Wild Heart of Africa, The Selous Game Reserve of Tanzania, Baldus ed., published by Rowland Ward in April 2009. • Wild edible mushrooms of the Miombo Woodlands in the Selous Niassa Wildlife Corridor in Miombo Magazine of Wildlife Conservation Society Tanzania 	
<p>Indicator 5. At least 5 visits to project sites by policy leaders by</p>		<p>Minister for Local Government and Regional Administration (now Prime Minister of Tanzania) visited Namtumbo and the SNWC project</p>	<p>S</p>

the end of the project		<p>office. The project organized a welcome and made a presentation at the CBCTC in Likuyu on the Project and issues of the Ruvuma River in 2006. The project was also presented at the Regional Investment Conference in Songea that was chaired by the Prime Minister. The National Uhuru Torch inaugurated the SNWC at a beacon between Tunduru and Namtumbo District. The Minister for Energy and Minerals visited Likuyu in 2009.</p> <p>A delegation composed of a representative of the German Ministry for Development Cooperation, the Country Director of KfW Tanzania and Country Director of GTZ visited the project in 2008.</p> <p>Regional Commissioner and Members of Parliament visited the project office on a regular basis</p>	
<p>Indicator 6.</p> <p>At least 5 visits to project sites undertaken by targeted government staff by end of the project</p>		<p>Visits to project sites by target staff continued through project life. Visits included attending meetings of Project Steering Committees.</p> <p>3 Visits facilitated (including DCs, RCs – District Security Committee, Regional Defense and Security Committee.</p>	MS

		One visit facilitated for DCs, DEDs and District Council chairpersons including other members of the steering committee to Marumba village to discuss issues at place.	
Overall Rating: Project Outcome 5			S
Outcome 6	Effective project administration, monitoring and coordination enabled timely and efficient implementation of project activities		
Indicator 1. Employment of personnel	4 staff	The District Lands, Natural Resources and Environment Departments (LNRED) in Namtumbo and Tunduru District Councils recruited in total 8 new staff in wildlife management, forestry and fisheries. The young professionals will be deployed to project sites (CBOs and villages) to support activity implementation. There will be a need to keep such staff motivated if they are to stay at these levels of operation. Motivation may include schedule of duties including some research work.	HS
Indicator 2 Equipment	Vehicles, computers, office equipment , electrification, radios internet connection	The Government of Tanzania provided a vehicle that is used by PM. This improved contact with communities.	S
Overall Rating: Outcome 6			HS

Table 4: Overall Project Assessment

Project Level	Rating
Project Objective	S
Outcome 1	HS
Outcome 2	S
Outcome 3	S
Outcome 4	Cannot be rated
Outcome 5	S
Outcome 6	HS
Overall Project Rating	S

Rating Key: HS = Highly Successful; S = Successful; MS = Moderately Successful; MU = Moderately Unsuccessful; U = Unsuccessful; HU = Highly Unsuccessful

5.0 Project Impact and Sustainability

5.1 Project Impact

The impact of the project should first focus on the communities in the twelve villages who are the primary stakeholders and beneficiaries of sustainable biodiversity and natural resources conservation in the corridor. Project impact so far has been in the form of increased awareness of the need to conserve the corridor and its resources among community participating community groups. All communities visited understand the importance of conservation in the area with most of them having established procedures for improved resource management such as anti-poaching. Management institutions such as natural resources management committees have also been established in all participating villages thereby laying the foundation for communities eventually being responsible for managing the resources that they live with and depend upon for their survival.

Increased awareness has however not been accompanied by tangible benefits that can truly build the positive attitudes of communities and change their behavior to support conservation. It is the view of the evaluation team that the project period was too short to create durable impacts in this regard. Projects that target behavioral change have high transaction costs both in terms of money and time and sustainable impacts are only realized after long periods of time, usually averaging eight (8) to ten (10) years. The attainment of AA status is imperative for communities to sustain their awareness and participation in conservation of wildlife resource in the corridor. It is therefore important that the DW has expressed willingness to assist communities with this aspect of project implementation. There is need for following up on this issue in the post project implementation phase.

The impact at the project office is apparent at Namtumbo where there are all essential administration and management facilities and infrastructure. The project will close and leave the office with vehicles, computer, internet service and a website. Tunduru district is disadvantaged on this aspect but will catch up under the SNWPC/KfW project. Namtumbo district should therefore keep disseminating project information and best practices using the equipment and facilities.

The project has built capacity of the technical staff in the LNRED in Namtumbo and Tunduru District Councils and the departments have been bolstered by employing new staff. This impact will remain in the two districts for long. It is important that the experienced staff also in the districts assume the role of training these new staff in their respective areas of technical expertise.

5.2 Project Effectiveness

The SNWC Project has effectively demonstrated that conservation projects need to address development concerns of community groups for them to be effective. The focus of the project on the creation of opportunities for benefit sharing among participating communities has resulted in increased interest in conservation among these communities. This is borne out by the readiness of the youth in the area to volunteer for training as village game scouts and the continued engagement of various segments of the communities in the process despite the delayed realization of direct benefits from conservation of wildlife resources.

It is generally understood that projects that target community involvement in conservation and awareness creation are expensive and time consuming. A lot of funding agencies avoid supporting such initiatives for this reason. The SNWC project, with GEF support has managed to galvanize participating communities in the corridor into functional units that are now set to be recognized in a space of four years. In addition, land use plans and resource use zones have been designated which should lead to the identification and securing of the boundaries of the wildlife corridor. The fact that all these results have been achieved within budget is a clear indication that the project has been cost effective

5.3 Project Relevance

The Government of Tanzania promotes community participation in the management of wildlife resources especially in areas where the lack of such involvement could result in uncontrolled off takes. This is in line with the provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity which Tanzania is a party to, which promotes the involvement of community groups in this conservation effort as well as the development of an enabling legislative framework for the management of threatened plant species. This aspect of the project also contributes to the GEF objective.

The SNWC project was introduced to stem the increased illegal off takes of wildlife in the corridor linking Selous and Niassa Game Reserves. When this project is fully institutionalized, it will result in the creation of the largest conservation area in the world. The involvement of community groups in this effort will contribute to poverty alleviation and sustainable development in the corridor.

5.4 Project Efficiency

The project was implemented through the involvement of both central and local government entities in the implementation of activities. This strategy assisted with the avoidance of setting up a huge project management entity as most of the work was mainstreamed into on-going programmes. This management system promoted efficiency and cost-effectiveness as it reduced transaction costs at the project management level. Without these management structures the project would have had to recruit a larger technical advisory team than the Technical Advisor who was the principal staff person recruited through the project. The

evaluation team also identified situations where elements of the project were being considered as part of the district level planning processes with financial resources allocated to them. This institutionalization of the project guaranteed sustainability of the initiative at least cost.

The three elements of Effectiveness, Relevance and Efficiency were rated as shown in the table below. The project was adjudged to have been Successful.

Measure of Results Achievement	Rating
Relevance	S
Effectiveness	S
Overall Rating	S

Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Unsatisfactory (U): The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

5.5 Project Sustainability

The project sustainability can be considered from many aspects but importantly governance, institutional, social and financial sustainability. The sustainability of the project should primarily focus on communities that are primary stakeholders and beneficiaries. The Governance and institutional capacities at community level have been well developed through leadership and management training, and provision of offices with basic facilities for the CBOs. Natural resource user groups have been established and structured around IGA groups in fish farming and beekeeping. These institutions will further be enhanced by the SNWPC/KfW project which is already on the ground.

An issue of concern is that of financial sustainability which cannot be predicated upon donor support. The communities have no financial sustainability because

they have not started earning income either from WMAs or IGAs. CBOs like Chingoli expressed concern that they will have financial hardships to process their application for AA registration and attending important meetings related with WMAs. This issue was addressed at the MTE with recommendations made to target programmes such as UNDP-SGP as sources of potential additional support. A lasting solution to this problem is the institutionalization of community resource management and ownership regimes that allow communities to realize benefits from such resources. The readiness to expedite the granting of user rights expressed by the WD is critical in this respect and should be pursued without delay as this is the only way communities will be able to enter into deals and agreements with investors that will enable them to generate sustainable levels of income thereby guaranteeing them financial sustainability. For this to happen though it will be necessary that the SNWC project put in place a management system that will allow continued support to communities with this process which was embedded under Outcome/Output 3 of the project. If support is stopped at project termination by the end of July, it is doubtful that community groups on their own will be able to negotiate these rights with government agencies such as DW and FBD. UNDP-GEF need to find ways to continue providing such support either through the other programmes that they are supporting or through support that will have the current Project Manager support the communities for another year and see these issues through.

The issue of socio-economic sustainability is ambivalent. Communities have embraced responsible biodiversity and natural resource management that has resulted in increased wildlife populations which in turn are now a menace because the wildlife is now destroying their farms and hence threatening food security. In the absence of pragmatic benefit interventions to offset conservation costs, communities will disengage themselves from responsible natural resources conservation in the corridor.

The Tunduru and Namtumbo districts as secondary stakeholders have established governance and institutional sustainability because technical staff in the natural resources sectors has been fully involved in the project through meetings, facilitating communities to establish CBOs, IGAs and small enterprises. The technical staff that was involved in the project will continue using knowledge, skills and experiences gained from the project for other intervention within their districts or elsewhere in the country. At the district level they have built a sustainable institutional rapport with communities.

One institutional advantage of the SNWC was its operational anchorage at the district council offices and its integration in the districts action and operation plans. The integration established a seamless link with communities and the councils. Tunduru District has allocated Tshs 30 million in its three Medium Term Strategic Plan (MTSP) to finance some of the project activities and the project will get Tshs 10 million each year based on annual Medium Term Expenditure Framework budgeting process (MTEF). Namtumbo District Council is in the

process of preparing its MTSP and it is expected that the council will allocate funds for the project in the next three years. The budget approved by Tunduru District Council is minimal in financial magnitude but its implication is phenomenal at the district council because it was endorsed by all councilors including those that their villages are not members of the project.

An element of sustainability that has linkages with GEF strategic interest is that of environmental sustainability. As a conservation and development project SNWC has the potential to influence national processes that lead to improved environmental management. The involvement of community groups in the management of the miombo ecosystem which constitutes the water towers of southern Africa will effectively contribute to the protection of the world's largest protected area. In addition to protection of biodiversity and conservation of watersheds, the effective protection of this ecosystem will result in the creation of a large carbon sink and therefore contribute to the climate change mitigation agenda. This aspect could provide for the community groups and Tanzania as a country accessing financial resources from carbon trading that can be used for other development purposes. UNDP Tanzania will need to follow up on this dimension of the project with a view to linking it with the REDD initiative that is already under implementation through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism.

Table 5: Assessment of Sustainability of Project Outcomes

Aspect of Sustainability	Assessment
Financial Resources	ML
Social and Political	L
Institutional Framework and Governance	L
Environmental	L
Overall Assessment	ML

Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability

Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

5.6 Contribution to upgrading skills at national level

Tanzania has many critical wildlife corridors that are threatened by encroachment from human settlement and cultivation and the Wildlife Act is silent on their conservation. The SNWC is the first pilot projection on the conservation of wildlife

corridors and its success will inform the Government of Tanzania on securing other critical wildlife corridors by, realigning its policies and legislation on wildlife corridors and building synergies with government agencies, conservation and development partners and the private sector. The Wildlife Division has actively participated in the project by designating a PM and the DW attending the meetings of the steering committee. In addition, district level staff members in various government entities have been exposed to the processes that are involved in the implementation of this project. The experience they have gained from this will be useful in the implementation of similar projects elsewhere in the country. Another project with assistance from WWF is establishing a corridor between Selous and Niassa Reserve copying the same approach and concept of the SNWC. The officer in charge was previously District Game Officer of Namtumbo District where he developed the necessary skills.

6.0 Lessons Learnt

Wildlife management and conservation projects require baseline data so that progress with their implementation can be tracked over their implementation timeframes.

The project area is in a remote part of Tanzania which was also adversely affected by the negative security situation that was caused by the Mozambican liberation war and the subsequent civil war. This situation meant that comprehensive ecological surveys could be conducted in the area prior to project implementation. The Selous Niassa Wildlife Corridor Research project that was carried out in cooperation with the Institute for Zoo and Wildlife Research Berlin, TAWIRI, University SUA Morogoro, Wildlife Department and GTZ projects between 2001 and 2003 formed the first comprehensive ecological survey that has been conducted in the area. This has been augmented by aerial animal censuses that have been conducted over the area since 1998. The Ruvuma River Study that was conducted in the Corridor on 174 km river length in cooperation with the Niassa National Reserve in 2006 also provides a detailed description of the wildlife, fish, birdlife, crocodile populations and socio-economic issues along Ruvuma River. The SNWC project also funded a socio-economic survey of the corridor area which however was adjudged to be inadequate. Because of the short time frame covered by these studies and surveys, the baseline situation in the corridor is not clearly understood resulting in assessments of animal populations in the project area being at best anecdotal. This is an issue which will need to be attended to in future to enable project managers to track the changes taking place with regards to the ecological and socio-economic situation in the project area.

The project objective was to achieve integrated conservation and development with local communities as key actors and beneficiaries. This aspect introduced a clear political dimension to the project which was correctly articulated by project

management right from the beginning. Stakeholder buy-in was solicited through consultations involving a broad spectrum of interest groups including administrative, political and civil society entities represented in both the Tanzania section of the corridor as well as the Niassa district of Mozambique.

The project also recognized the importance of land in the social and economic development processes in the corridor area.

Natural resources and land were recognized as the lifeline of rural communities in the project area. This explains the attention given to land management legislation by the project at the outset. Capacity building was tailored on land legislation, land utilization and land management with integrated natural resources management in cooperation with InWent, Capacity Building International, Germany and the University of Dar es Salaam and Sokoine University of Agriculture in Morogoro.

Literacy levels are low in the project area resulting in traditions taking a strong hold on social development initiatives. This usually results in the marginalization of women in the process. The SNWC Project however promoted the participation of women in training programmes resulting in them playing an active role in the institutions such as natural resources committees and community based organizations that have been built during the project lifespan. Village Natural Resources Committees and Community Based Organizations, both have a high percentage of women in leading positions.

Community projects require provision of sustainable sources of funding for them to survive beyond donor support. The project has built an environment that is supportive of the establishment of both individual as well as group based IGA enterprises. However, these initiatives and groups will need start-up capital for them to establish viable enterprises. It is noteworthy that the project has introduced the concept of SACCOS banks through the Chamber of Commerce of Ruvuma Region. A bank has recently opened a branch at Lusewa which is expected to cater for the entire southern region of the corridor. In addition, the project provided enterprise development and management training to members of CBOs participating in the activities supported by SNCWP. This training emphasized the need for the introduction of the SACCOS Banking system as a source of credit.

There is a need for the SNWCP initiative to be linked to global initiatives such as climate change mitigation through which additional resources can be leveraged to support development programmes in the area. The MNRT under FBD is implementing a REDD project it's the objective of which is to reward those who reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. In simple terms, it "pays those that reduce deforestation and forest degradation". The SNWP objectives are relevant to the REDD project and communities can be beneficiaries from this initiative. Since Sasawara Forest Reserve is managed by FBD it is an appropriate pilot site in the corridor area. The core benefit from

proper management of the forest under REDD is enhanced capacity of the area as a carbon sink and co-benefits will be improved catchment, biodiversity conservation, soil fertility and productivity in adjacent farming communities. There are stringent conditions for a community or an individual to trade carbon on the carbon market. Some of the conditions include control of wildfires, illegal harvesting of forest products, and control of destruction of vegetation by wildlife, overgrazing and mining. These conditions are possible with engagement of communities to manage Sasawara Forest Reserve as a Joint Forest Management (JFM) area and at the same time as part of the WMA. The lessons learnt from SFR can be replicated in the corridor and other parts of the country. Details of this matter can be pursued by SNWC and articulated by DW and FBD.

The commitment of support agencies to projects such as SNWC is critical for their implementation. The lack of engagement by some of these entities could result in failure to realize project objectives. The Project Steering Committee was well constituted but members from the central government were passive on attendance except the WD. The forum was important for many purposes, such as developing linkages and synergies with ministries and other agencies, sharing lessons and efficient use of resources. The Division of Environment (DoE) in the Vice President's Office (VPO) was one of the key institutional stakeholders through the PSRP-MKUKUTA project funded by UNDP that should have been proactively involved. The project focuses its intervention on capacity building at district level and local level planning in village and communities. The PSRP-MKUKUTA project still has the opportunity to contribute to some of the activities that require follow up such as capacity building of village governments, CBOs and IGA groups.

Projects that are designed with specific time frames should have the provision for clear exit strategies. The project exit strategy was not clear to most communities like CBOs. The potential for continued support from the SNWPC is also not clearly understood by most community members. The SNWPC will provide vehicles but not fuel and will not pay night out allowances to VGS when they conduct patrols. These conditions would have worked well if the CBOs had attained AA status and user rights whereby income would be accrued from hunting and other economic activities. In the absence of this opportunity, the WD should consider to provide the software packages that were in SNWCP while expediting the process of gazeting CBOs as AA and issuing them user rights in their WMAs. Other entities which can be brought in to implement the exit strategy are the Division of Tourism in MNRT to offer advisory services and capacity building on development and management of responsible tourism, Tanzania Tourism Board to promote tourism in the WMAs and the private sector to invest in the area both in consumptive and non consumptive natural resource utilization. Initial contacts established with these entities by the project will need to be followed up in the post-project period.

As projects such as SNWC are implemented, their spheres of influence can expand beyond originally intended boundaries. Today there are villages that are expressing interest in being included in the WMA because of their close proximity to the project. This is a positive project spin off deserving attention by the SNWC together with WD. If this interest is ignored the communities in these villages could frustrate the achievements made by SNWC through engaging in or facilitating poaching, starting wildfires and encroachment into the corridor area.

7.0 Conclusions and Recommendations.

7.1 Conclusions

The Development and Management of the Selous-Niassa Wildlife corridor project has been under implementation since July 2005. The project purpose is to promote the conservation of the natural resources in the corridor through a community based approach. The conservation of the corridor is predicated upon the improvement of the capacities of the residents in the area and the realization of direct benefits by these same communities. The project purpose is in line with both Government of Tanzania and UNDP objectives of protection of biodiversity.

Since inception, the project has focused on building the capacities of community groups in twelve villages in the south of the corridor to facilitate their engagement in conservation initiatives as has been happening in the north of the corridor over the past ten years. Improved capacity will equip these community groups with the necessary skills to manage the WMAs that are proposed for the area.

Progress has been recorded in the area of training and capacity building with more than 800 villagers having received training in various aspects of conservation from the project. In addition, 144 village game scouts have been trained and equipped to monitor resource use in the corridor and patrol the area to monitor illegal off-takes of resources. As a result of this training community awareness about the overall objectives of the project is high in the project area.

While no WMAs have been established in the project area, the project has embarked on training that prepares community groups for embarking upon the process of establishing and managing these entities. In addition, business entrepreneurial training has also been provided to prepare communities for managing business activities that have been suggested. These include tourism, bee keeping and fish farming. A major threat to the process of establishing WMAs is the prevailing legal environment especially with reference to wildlife management. Although the law provides for devolution of authority over wildlife resources to community groups, a high degree of control over the resources is still held by government through the Wildlife Division while the process to get WMAs legally designated is long and complicated. The transaction costs of establishing these WMAs have been estimated at US\$ 150000. Furthermore those AAs that are legally established and have received the user rights still do

not receive the benefits. There is no official benefit sharing formula from hunting tourism yet in place. The Wildlife Division has indicated their willingness to assist communities with acquiring AA status through training and capacity building. They point to the fact that eight WMAs have now been certified around the country as evidence of their commitment to the programme. It is understandable that the DW is concerned about doing things correctly and ensuring that the process of devolution of control over resources to community groups is done in terms of the law. This does not however require that the processes that are put in place to facilitate this are impossible for communities to follow.

Overall, the evaluation team is of the opinion that the project has achieved most of its intended objectives with the exception of the ones on the conservation of Sasawara Forest the documentation of experiences with the project implementation. The management of Sasawara Forest Reserve will require commitment of personnel and financial resources by the Division of Forestry and Beekeeping which the Director has now pledged. Although the project has commissioned studies that have contributed to greater understanding of the Selous Niassa wildlife corridor, it has not done much in the way of documenting project experiences. This is an issue that will require attention in the post project phase.

On the issue of project sustainability, the evaluation team is of the view that if the project closes as planned without provision for managing the transitional the gains achieved to date will be lost. There is need therefore for UNDP Tanzania and the Government of Tanzania to consider transitional management and support arrangements to allow for institutionalization of these project gains. Discussions have been initiated with UNDP Tanzania and an agreement has been reached for an additional allocation of US\$ 200,000 from core resources to cover transitional activities up to December 2009.

The overall rating of the project is “Highly Successful”.

7.2 Recommendations

The evaluation team makes the following recommendations for consideration by both UNDP-GEF and the government of Tanzania.

Recommendation 1: The Selous Niassa Wildlife Corridor Development project is as much a rural development project as it is a political process. Efforts need to be made to ensure that the project is located within the political and development processes in the Ruvuma region to ensure that environmental conservation is adequately addressed in overall development planning for the area. Interviews conducted with political leaders such as councilors in some of the wards indicated that these leaders were not formally included in the project implementation processes. The political leadership can help connect the project to on-going initiatives such as the Mtwara Development initiative. Comments on

political involvement already given before

Recommendation 2: The government of Tanzania should ensure that the high levels of expectations that have been created through the project are maintained in the post project period through providing continuing financial and technical support to the initiative. The project has received seed funding from UNDP-GEF which has generated a huge groundswell of support for conservation and development among community groups. Financial support could be provided through micro-lending facilities, cooperative support programmes and investments by individuals from within the participating communities

Recommendation 3: The DW should support community groups with the process of registration of WMAs and the acquisition of AA status. It is important that the minimum requirements for devolution of authority for wildlife management to community groups are met. However this process should not take as long as it has taken to date. The procedures for CBOs moving to AA status are all government processes. DW needs to assist community groups with these processes through training and capacity building. More importantly, DW should assist with ensuring that the technical support services such as legal advisory services, financial planning and registration of WMAs are provided through government entities and not through consultancy services. The division should also negotiate that any costs associated with these services are either waived or at least deferred until community groups can pay them from revenues derived from resource use. This way government will be seen to be contributing to community development.

Recommendation 4: UNDP-GEF and the government of Tanzania should consider continuing to support the SNWC project through the provision of technical assistance to ensure that the nascent projects that have been initiated do not collapse after project closure. Beekeeping and fish farming have only just been introduced into the project area among few community members and might not survive a sudden loss of support. The fisheries management on the Ruvuma River has recently been re-organized with the establishment of up to eighteen fisher groups. This process still needs support and cooperation with the fisheries section of the district. The current Project Manager seconded to the project by government should be facilitated to stay beyond project closure and work with these community groups for at least with the proviso that a new institutional framework for continuing with the project is identified to continue with supporting project implementation. This period should be used as a transitioning period from one funding arrangement to another.

Recommendation 5: Community groups that have embarked upon small enterprises with donor support should be introduced to organizations such as COCOBA for them to access independent funding for their operations. As described before promotion of SACCOs banks This will reduce dependency on donor organizations for funding and promote the spirit of self reliance.

Recommendation 6: Government should facilitate the exploitation of all the opportunities that are available for communities to access funding from global processes such as climate change mitigation through the enlistment of initiatives such as SNWC in carbon trading. This would be made possible through the recognition of the potential for carbon sequestration provided by a well preserved miombo woodland ecosystem. The REDD programme of the government of Tanzania could be used as the vehicle for this.

Recommendation 7: Government of Tanzania should formally engage the government of Mozambique and suggest the establishment of a Tran frontier Conservation Area (TFCA) encompassing Selous Game Reserve, Niassa game Reserve and the corridor between them. The designation of the TFCA would facilitate the introduction of common management systems throughout this elephant range and provide an enlarged scope for attracting conservation and development funding. Consideration could also be given to declare the area a World Heritage Site.

Recommendation 8: Opportunities for continued technical and financial support under other on-going programmes supported by UNDP in Tanzania should be assessed and promoted. UNDP currently supports programmes such as the Joint Programme on Environment and Integrating Environment into MKUKUTA which could be used as vehicles to continue with the work that SNWC was doing.

Recommendation 9: The project has conducted a comprehensive tourism potential study for the corridor. In addition, tourism development zones have been identified as part of the land use and resource management zoning plans that have been developed. When these plans are approved it is recommended that efforts be made to attract the private sector to invest in these areas to promote tourism that involves community groups. Additional potential for the involvement of the private sector are in the processing and marketing of wild honey and its by-products and wild mushrooms.

8.0 Annexes

Annex 1: Evaluation Terms of Reference

UNDP-GEF: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR TERMINAL EVALUATION

SELOUS-NIASSA WILDLIFE CORRIDOR PROJECT - TANZANIA

PROJECT SUMMARY

Project Title: The Development and Management of the Selous –

Niassa Wildlife Corridor in Tanzania

Project Number: 00038545
Focal Area: Conservation of Biological Biodiversity
GEF Strategic Priority: SO1, SP1
Country: United Republic of Tanzania
Duration: 51 Months
GEF Agency: UNDP
Executing Agency: Government of Tanzania, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
Implementing Agencies: The Wildlife Division of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism and GTZ-International Services (GTZ-IS), a branch of Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ).

Budget:

UNDP/GEF Direct Financing		
UNDP/GEF:		US\$
986,500		
PDFA		US\$
	13,500	
Co-financing:		
GTZ/SCP		US\$
	500,000	
IZW/GTZ:		
Govt Input:		US\$
	160,000	
UNDP/SCP:		US\$

Approval Date: 15 March, 2005
Effective Date: 01 May 2005
Primary Beneficiaries: Environment
Secondary Beneficiaries: Local communities
DCAS Sector/Subsector: Natural Resources
ACC Sector/Sub-sector: Biological Resources

Project Summary

This Medium Size Project aims at conserving the viable wildlife corridor between Selous and Niassa Game Reserves through establishment of a network of Village Wildlife Management Areas (WMA's), recently provided for by Tanzania's new Wildlife Policy. The corridor is under threat through poaching for meat for the local market, poaching for ivory as a trans-boundary problem and habitat degradation due to uncontrolled and destructive wildfires caused by the local population. The creation of WMAs requires that local communities concerned participate in active planning, protection and management of these areas and will derive substantial benefits from wildlife management for their own development. Benefits could include legal supply of game meat, obtained through an annual hunting quota for each village, and income in terms of cash (for community projects) from sustainable utilization of wildlife with the possibility of photo or hunting tourism. Such permanent income generation will help ensure the sustainability of this project. Improved wildlife management of the WMA's will reduce destructive wildfires.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Selous – Niassa Wildlife Corridor is a landscape linkage connecting the largest game reserves of Africa, the Selous Game Reserve of Tanzania and the Niassa Game Reserve of Mozambique. In the past a community conservation concept, focussing on the establishment of communal Wildlife Management Areas, has been successfully implemented in the northern part of the corridor as part of a buffer zone concept for the Selous Game Reserve with the project "Selous Conservation Programme (SCP)". Other achievements of this joint project of the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) and the Wildlife Department have been: The establishment of the Community Based Conservation Training Centre (CBCTCT) in Likuyu located in the northern Corridor, two Wildlife Management Areas covering the northern part of the corridor and the identification of migration routes of elephants and other mammals during a three year lasting research project in cooperation with the Institute for Zoo and Wildlife Research Berlin, (IZW).

The GEF provided funding in order to achieve conservation and development of the southern part of the corridor with a community based approach and to establish a contiguous network of communal Wildlife Management Areas linking the Selous with the Niassa Reserve. The project was designed for 48 months implementation time which was extended to 51 months. A midterm evaluation was carried out in 2007 and project will finally be terminated at the end of July 2009. The project is being implemented by the Ministry for Natural Resources and Tourism and executed by the Wildlife Department and the German Agency for Technical Cooperation – International Services (GTZ-IS). The German Centre for International Migration and Development (CIM) provided for a technical adviser during the implementation time.

Other development partners joined later like the German Development Bank (KfW) with the project “Selous – Niassa Wildlife Protection Corridor “ and ADAP, a NGO from Switzerland, with the project “Development of Beekeeping in the Selous – Niassa Wildlife Corridor”. Two additional projects were financed by the UNDP/GEF Small Grant Programme.

2. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The UNDP/GEF project document was approved in March 2005, and activities started in July 2005 when the first disbursement was made. The GEF, provided funding for the development of community based conservation in the southern part of the Corridor, focusing on biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of natural resources while empowering local communities and reducing their poverty according to national strategies, policies and legislations.

The project was mandated with the following goals and objectives:

The Goal of the Project:

The wide scale adoption of the Wildlife Management Areas Initiative throughout the country increases area of land under biodiversity conservation while the biodiversity and habitats are conserved in the globally significant Selous - Niassa Miombo forest corridor of Tanzania.

The Project’s immediate objectives are:

- The Selous Niassa Wildlife Corridor is secured by establishing management systems that promote community participation in conservation.
- Benefits from wildlife management enhance the livelihood security of villages with WMAs in process, and promote the long-term conservation of the corridor.

To achieve the above objectives the following six outcomes were identified:

1. Greater awareness and capacities for conservation of biodiversity and natural resources within the corridor among communities, local and district authorities.
2. Information data bases on ecological and socio-economic environment in the corridor created for use as decision support tools by planning authorities
3. The process for the establishment of a network of WMAs throughout the corridor finalized and application submitted to WD.
4. Communities participate in conservation of Sasawara Forest Reserve.
5. Best practice on establishment of WMAs documented and disseminated to influence implementation of national policy

6. Project effectively managed, monitored and evaluated.

GEF objective and purpose of terminal evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation in the Global Environment Facility (GEF) projects have the following overarching objectives:

- To promote accountability for the achievement of GEF objectives through the assessment of results, effectiveness, processes, and performance of the partners involved in GEF activities. GEF results are monitored and evaluated for their contribution to global environmental benefits.
- To promote learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing on results and lessons learned among the GEF and its partners, as a basis for decision-making on policies, strategies, program management, and projects, and to improve knowledge and performance

The purposes of conducting evaluations includes the understanding of why and the extent to which intended and unintended results are achieved, and their impact on stakeholders. Evaluation is an important source of evidence of the achievement of results and institutional performance, and contributes to knowledge and to organizational learning. Evaluation should serve as an agent of change and play a critical role in supporting accountability.

In accordance, all full and medium-size projects supported by GEF are subject to a final evaluation upon completion of implementation. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to GEF Councils' decisions on transparency and better access to information during implementation and on completion of a project.

Specifically, the Terminal Evaluation (TE) must provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of a completed project by assessing its project design, process of implementation and results vis-à-vis project objectives endorsed by the GEF including the agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation. TEs have four complementary purposes as follows:

- To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose levels of project accomplishments;
- To synthesize lessons that may help improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF activities;
- To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues; and,
- To contribute to the GEF Evaluation Office databases for aggregation, analysis and reporting on effectiveness of GEF operations in achieving

global environmental benefits and on quality of monitoring and evaluation across the GEF system.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These can be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THIS TERMINAL EVALUATION

This terminal evaluation (TE) is being carried out to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the Selous – Niassa Wildlife Corridor project by assessing its project design, the process of implementation and results and outputs vis-à-vis project objectives endorsed by the GEF and other partners (Govt, UNDP, KfW) including the agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation. Specifically, the Terminal Evaluation will undertake the following tasks:

- Assess overall performance and review progress towards attaining the project's objectives and results including relevancy, efficiency and effectiveness of the actions taken given the available funding and capacities for implementation.
- Review and evaluate the extent to which the project outputs and outcomes have been achieved, and the shortcomings in reaching project objectives as stated in the project document.
- Assess the project results and determine the extent to which the project objective was achieved, or is expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to any positive or negative consequences.
- Assess the extent at which the project impacts have reached or have the potential to reach the intended beneficiaries; in particular, the balance between conservation and livelihood actions spearheaded through the project.
- To critically analyze the implementation arrangements and identify strengths and weaknesses in the project design and implementation

Describe the project's adaptive management strategy – how have project activities changed in response to new conditions, (e.g. recommendations of the MTE) and have the changes been appropriate in particular the issue of capacity;

Assess the project's contribution to the GEF Strategic Priority for catalyzing sustainability of Protected Areas (PAs) in particular improving opportunities for sustainable use, benefit sharing and broad stakeholder's participation among communities.

- Review the clarity of roles and responsibilities of the various agencies and

institutions and the level of coordination between relevant players. In particular look at the roles of the Project team, district authorities, and MNRT.

Assess the level of stakeholder involvement in the project from community to higher Government levels and recommend on whether this involvement has been appropriate to the goals of the project.

Describe and assess efforts of UNDP (CO and UNDP-GEF) in support of the implementation.

Review donor partnership processes, and the contribution of co-finance.

- Describe key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects for sustainability of project results achieved. Assess the likelihood of continuation of project activities/results, outcomes/benefits after completion of GEF funding, considering the “traditional” economic activities in which these communities are involved.

Identify and document the main successes, challenges and lessons that have emerged in terms of:

Strengthening country ownership, initiative and leadership;

Community level assessment and stakeholder participation at all stages of the project cycle;

Communication approaches and strategies and their impact on behavioral changes and raising awareness at all levels – both in country, regionally and internationally.

Application of adaptive management strategies;

National cooperation, intra governmental cooperation and other project management initiatives

Efforts to secure sustainability; (see the new GEF format for assessment of sustainability)

Role of M&E in project implementation as required by GEF guidelines.

In describing all lessons learned, an explicit distinction needs to be made between those lessons applicable only to this project, and lessons that may be of value more broadly, including to other similar projects in the UNDP/GEF pipeline portfolio.

Note: To determine the level of achievement of the project outcome and objectives, see the guidance provided in the annex 2.

4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

Three main elements to be evaluated are Delivery, Implementation and Finances. Each component will be evaluated using three criteria: effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness

Project delivery: The TE will assess to what extent the SNWC has achieved its immediate objectives. It will also identify what outputs, impacts and results have been produced and how they have enabled the project to achieve its objectives. The consultants are required to make assessment of the following issues under each priority areas outlined below:

Institutional arrangement

- Preparatory work and implementation strategies
- Consultative processes
- Technical support
- Capacity building initiatives
- Project outputs
- Assumptions and risks
- Project related complementary activities

Outcome, results and impacts

- Efficiency of all project activities under the three major components
- Progress in the achievement of the immediate objectives (include level of indicator achievement when available)

Partnerships

- Assessment of national level involvement and perception
- Assessment of local partnerships, and involvement of stakeholders
- Assessment of regional collaboration between government, intergovernmental and non -governmental organizations

Risk management

- Were problems/constraints, which impacted on successful delivery of the project, identified at the project design stage and subsequently as part of the Mid Term Evaluation (MTE)?
- Were there new threats/risks to project success that emerged during project implementation?
- Were both kinds of risk appropriately dealt with?
- Were recommendations arising from the MTE addressed?

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Assess the extent, appropriateness and effectiveness of adaptive management at all levels of the project implementation
- Has there been a monitoring and evaluation framework for the project and how was this developed?
- Is the reporting framework effective/appropriate?
- Has M&E been used as a management tool in directing the project implementation in a timely manner and ensuring ongoing participation at all levels?
- Is this framework suitable for replication/continuation for any future project support?

Project Implementation

- Review the project management and implementation arrangements at all levels, in order to provide an opinion on its efficiency and cost effectiveness. This includes:
 - i. Processes and administration:
 - Project related administration procedures
 - Milestones(Log-frame matrix)
 - Key decisions and out puts,
 - Major project implementation documents prepared with an indication of how the documents and reports have been useful and
 - ii. Project oversight and active engagement by: UNDP/GEF and participating country mechanisms (Project steering committee)
 - iii. Project execution: Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism and GTZ-IS as the executing agencies
 - iv. Project implementation: UNDP as the Implementing Agency

Project Finances

How well and cost effectively have financial arrangements of the project worked?
This section will focus on the following three priority areas:

1. Project disbursements
 - Provide an overview of actual spending against budget expectations
 - With appropriate explanation and background provide a breakdown of the ration of the funds spent “directly” in-country against total funds spent

- With appropriate explanation and background provide a breakdown of the ration of the funds spent “indirectly” in-country (i.e. external consultants and regional training) against total funds spent and
 - Critically analyze disbursements to determine if funds have been applied effectively and efficiently.
2. Budget procedures
- Did the Project Document provide adequate guidance on how to allocate the budget?
 - Review of audits and any issues raised in audits and subsequent adjustments to accommodate audit recommendations;
 - Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and provide an opinion on the appropriateness and relevancy of such revisions
3. Coordination mechanisms
- Evaluate appropriateness and efficiency of coordinating mechanisms between national agencies, UNDP and the GEF
 - Does the SNWC approach represent an effective means of achieving the objectives?
 - How can the approach be improved?

5. EXPECTED OUTPUT

The TE evaluators will be expected to produce:

A) An inception report: The consultants’ team will prepare a brief inception note within 3 days of commencement of the TE reflecting in it all substantive and logistical issues that would have to be addressed in order to complete the review successfully.

B) Presentation of the findings to key stakeholders in a joint UNDP/GEF Govt. incl. MNRT/WD and Local Gov. District team or Steering Committee (Possibly Power point slides) covering key findings of the TE and obtain participatory comments from relevant stakeholders.

C) An evaluation report: Stands alone document approximately 45-50 pages that substantiate its recommendations and conclusions. The report shall be structured along the outline indicated in the TOR

- Include a detailed record of consultations with stakeholders (to be provided as part of the information gathered by the evaluators), as an annex to the main report.
- If there are any significant discrepancies between the impressions and findings of the evaluation team and stakeholders these should be explained in an Annex attached to the final report.

- An updated METT (Monitoring Effectiveness Tracking Tool), with Evaluators comments.

A draft of both **B** and **C** above should be submitted at the end of the in-country component of the evaluator's mission, and a final copy within a further two weeks after receiving written comments on the drafts.

The draft and final versions of the products should be submitted to UNDP and the project team, who will be responsible for circulating it to key stakeholders.

6. METHODOLOGY OF EVALUATION APPROACH

The evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner through a combination of processes. The primary purpose of the evaluation is to improve the project; for this to happen all stakeholders must fully understand and identify with the evaluation report, even if they might disagree with some of the contents. The evaluation will start with a review of the key project documentation including key reports and correspondence. It will include visits to UNDP Country Office, Project Executing Offices of Government as well as selected national partners and stakeholders, including interviews (by phone if necessary) with key individuals both within the project, the government, and independent observers of the project and its activities. Field visits to project sites will be conducted to view activities first hand and to meet with site partners, local leaders, and local government officials. **Note:** not ALL project sites need be visited. It is suggested that the Evaluation Team discuss the optimum number and duration of site visits with the Project team at the start

It is anticipated that the methodology to be used for the TE will include the following:

A) Review of documentation including but not limited to:-

- Project Document
- Project implementation reports (APR/PIR's);
- Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams;
- Audit reports
- Mid Term Evaluation report
- M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project;
- Baselines and other study reports produced during the project implementation
- The National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (MKUKUTA)
- District Development Plans

- Policies, Legislations and Regulations regarding land and natural resources management.

The following documents will also be available:

- Minutes of the project Steering Committee and Technical Committee meetings;
- MAPs of the Selous – Niassa Wildlife Corridor Area
- MoU between the UNDP and KfW on project implementation
- MoU between the Regional Administrations of Tanzania and Provinces of Mozambique on cross-border cooperation and implementation reports as well as minutes
- The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks
- Technical reports and publications
- Documents on project website: www.selous-niassa-corridor.com

B) Interviews in the field with stakeholders shall include:

- Project team and UNDP staff who have project responsibilities;
- Regional and District authorities and technical officers
- MNRT/Wildlife Department
- The Permanent Secretary of the MNRT, Chair of the Steering Committee.
- Project stakeholders, particularly members of the various steering committees and project beneficiaries e.g. Village and village natural resources committee and CBO chairpersons;
- KfW and ADAP project teams

C) Presentation of the findings

The initial conclusions and recommendations will be presented to the Project team, Technical Steering Committee and UNDP/GEF for their comments. Once these are integrated, a final draft will be presented to UNDP for comments by wider group of stakeholders. Written comments will be submitted to the team leader for finalization of the TE report within a period of two weeks

7. ATTRIBUTES OF THE EVALUATION CONSULTANTS

The TE will be conducted by an independent International Consultant, who will be a team leader in collaboration with a local consultant. The SNWC project management (Manager) will provide support in the field as may be required including making appointments with regional, district and village stakeholders. The International consultant will be responsible for the delivery, content, technical quality and accuracy of the evaluation, as well as the recommendations. The

local consultant will facilitate and enrich sharing of national experiences and communication with local communities by providing interpretation from Swahili to English and vice versa. Required competencies will include:

A) International Consultant (Team leader) 20 working days

- Minimum of MSc degree in environmental related sciences, Natural resources Management, or Economics with proven practical background in academic and institutional aspects of biodiversity conservation projects and at least 15 years of relevant experience
- An understanding of GEF principles and expected impacts in terms of global benefits will be an advantage
- Experience in the Monitoring and evaluation of technical assistance projects, preferably with UNDP or any other United Nations development agencies and donors.
- Demonstrated practical and project implementation experience in participatory processes and socio economics in community based natural resources management and conservation.
- Demonstrated experience in institutional analysis
- Excellent English writing and communication skills. Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distil critical issues and draw forward looking conclusions.
- Excellent facilitation skills.

Some prior knowledge of the following would be ideal:

- GEF, UNDP reporting frameworks
- The Poverty Reduction Strategy for Tanzania and Government structures
- Knowledge to assess fit with CBD work programs and 2010 targets
- Millennium Development Goals

Fluency in English is required, a bit of Kiswahili would be an added advantage.

B) Local Consultant (Facilitator and team member) 15 working days

Competencies required will include:

- Minimum of MSc in Natural Resource Management or Environmental Sciences with some specialization on community development initiatives
- Conversant on national strategies and policies related to Wildlife management, Environment, Land, Forestry, Agriculture and poverty reduction to cite but a few.
- Experience in the Monitoring and evaluation of technical assistance projects, preferably with UNDP or any other United Nations development agencies and donors.

- Demonstrated practical and project implementation experience in participatory processes and socio economics in community based natural resources management and conservation.
- Demonstrated experience in institutional analysis
- Excellent in English and Swahili writing, communication and facilitation skills.
- Ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distil critical issues and draw forward looking conclusions.
- Minimum of 10 years working experience

8. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The evaluation will be conducted for a period of 20 working within the period 28th May 2009 to 26th June 2009. UNDP will finalize the TOR, recruit the consultants and coordinate the evaluation. The project will be responsible for logistical arrangements in the field (setting up meetings and organizing travel).

The evaluation will start with a review of the key project documentation including key reports and correspondence. It will include visits to executing and implementing agency offices, selected national project offices, interviews (by phone if necessary) with key individuals both within the project, the government, and independent observers of the project and its activities, as well as project personnel. Field visits to project sites will be conducted to view activities first hand and to meet with local leaders, Community Based Organizations and local government officials.

9. REPORT SAMPLE OUTLINE

Terminal Evaluation Report – Sample outline

1. Executive summary

- Brief description of project;
- Context and purpose of the evaluation;
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned;

2. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation;
- Key issues addressed;
- Methodology of the evaluation;
- Structure of the evaluation.

3. The project(s) and its development context

- Project start and its duration;
- Problems that the project seek to address;
- Immediate and development objectives of the project;
- Main stakeholders;
- Results expected.

4. Findings and Conclusions

4.1 Project Formulation

- ✓ Implementation
- ✓ Stakeholder participation
- ✓ Replication approach
- ✓ Cost effectiveness
- ✓ Linkage of the project and other interventions within the sector
- ✓ Indicators

4.2. Project Implementation

- ✓ Delivery
- ✓ Financial management
- ✓ Monitoring and evaluation
- ✓ Execution and implementation modalities
- ✓ Management by UNDP and other partners
- ✓ Coordination and operational issues

4.3 Results to date

- ✓ Attainment of Objectives
- ✓ Sustainability
- ✓ Contribution to upgrading skills at National level

5.0 Lessons learned

6.0 Conclusions and recommendations

7.0 Evaluation report Annexes

- Evaluation TORs , Itinerary and list of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits, including evaluators findings, issues raised and recommendations by different stakeholders
- List of documents reviewed

- Questionnaire used and summary of results if any
- Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)

Annex 1. Tentative schedule for the evaluation

Day	Dates	PLACE	PURPOSE
1	28 th May	Arrive DSM	Consultant arrival, meet with Project Manager and UNDP and start to review documents.
2	29 th May	DSM	Meet with Director Wildlife, Country Director GTZ
	30 th May	DSM	Production of Inception report and discussion to agree on methodology and field schedule with UNDP, Director of Wildlife, GTZ and Project management.
4	31 st May	To Songea	Travel day by car to Songea
5	1 st June	To Namtumbo	Meet with RAS Ruvuma Region: continue to Namtumbo, Meet with DC, DED, Project Team,
6	2 nd June	Namtumbo	Meet District Nat Res. Dep, KfW project team, review additional documents
7 – 9	3rd-5 th June	Namtumbo	Field; Villages and CBO Kimbanda in Lusewa, CBO Kisungule – continue to Marumba/Tunduru –(overnight)
		Tunduru	Field Villages and CBO Chingole, travel to Tunduru town– overnight Tunduru town
		Tunduru/Namtumbo	Meet with DC, DED, Nat Res. Team Tunduru – continue back to Namtumbo
10	6 th June	Namtumbo	TE Team Data Analyses, drafting report
11	7 th June	Namtumbo	Data Analysis and drafting report, preparation of presentation
12	8 th June	Namtumbo	Data Analysis and drafting report, preparation of presentation – move to Songea
13	9 th June	Songea	Presentation to the Members of Steering, and Technical Committee. Team discusses feedback and agrees on content of report.
14	10 th June.		Travel back to DSM
15	11 th June		Provide highlights to UNDP and Fly out of Tanzania
16-18	12 th -14 th June	Fly Out	Consultant to write up report (3days)

19	15 th June		Consultant to submit draft report to UNDP in order to circulate to project team members for comments (one week)
26	22 nd June		UNDP, Participating Agencies & Project to submit comments to consultant for incorporation (1 day)
27	26 th June		Final Report to be submitted to UNDP (1day)

Annex 2 Explanation on Terminology provided in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations

Implementation Approach includes an analysis of the project's logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:

- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

Country Ownership/Drivenness is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable. Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans

Some elements of effective country ownership/drivenness may include:

- Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans
- Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
- Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
- The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project
- The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives

For projects whose main focus and actors are in the private-sector rather than public-sector (e.g., IFC projects), elements of effective country ownership/drivenness that demonstrate the interest and commitment of the local private sector to the project may include:

- The number of companies that participated in the project by: receiving technical assistance, applying for financing, attending dissemination events, adopting environmental standards promoted by the project, etc.
- Amount contributed by participating companies to achieve the environmental benefits promoted by the project, including: equity invested, guarantees provided, co-funding of project activities, in-kind contributions, etc.
- Project's collaboration with industry associations

Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement consists of three related, and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and "stakeholder" participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

Information dissemination

- Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns

Consultation and stakeholder participation

- Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of NGOs, community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities

Stakeholder participation

- Project institutional networks well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure
- Building partnerships among different project stakeholders
- Fulfillment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved.

Sustainability measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

- Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy.
- Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project's objectives).
- Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector.
- Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives.
- Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.
- Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) .
- Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes).
- Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities.
- Achieving stakeholders' consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.

Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:

- Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc).
- Expansion of demonstration projects.
- Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project's achievements in the country or other regions.
- Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project's outcomes in other regions.

Financial Planning includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.

Effective financial plans include:

- Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing¹.
- Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables
- Due diligence due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.

Co-financing includes: Grants, Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate), Credits, Equity investments, and In-kind support, other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.

Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.

Cost-effectiveness assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project's outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project's compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:

- Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have taken place without GEF funding.) and securing co-funding and associated funding.
- The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effectively as initially planned.

¹ Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6. The following page presents a table to be used for reporting co-financing.

- The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts)

Efficiency: Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was then did that affect cost-effectiveness? Wherever possible the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

The evaluation of relevancy, effectiveness and efficiency will be as objective as possible and will include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. Ideally the project monitoring system should deliver quantifiable information that can lead to a robust assessment of project's effectiveness and efficiency. Since projects have different objectives assessed results are not comparable and cannot be aggregated. To track the health of the portfolio project outcomes will be rated as follows:

Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Unsatisfactory (U) The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall outcome rating of the project may not be higher than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes a project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.

The evaluators will also assess positive and negative actual (or anticipated) impacts or emerging long term effects of a project. Given the long term nature of impacts, it might not be possible for the evaluators to identify or fully assess impacts. Evaluators will nonetheless indicate the steps taken to assess project

impacts, especially impacts on local populations², local environment (e.g. increase in the number of individuals of an endangered species, improved water quality, increase in fish stocks, reduced greenhouse gas emissions) and wherever possible indicate how the findings on impacts will be reported to the GEF in future.

Assessment of Sustainability of project outcomes

The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2006, specifies that a TE will assess at the minimum the “likelihood of sustainability³ of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this.” The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability. Following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability will be addressed:

- **Financial resources:** Are there any financial risks involved in sustaining the project outcomes? What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will not be available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?
- **Sociopolitical:** Are there any social or political risks that can undermine the longevity of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- **Institutional framework and governance:** Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose any threat to the continuation of project benefits? While assessing on this parameter also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how is in place.
- **Environmental:** Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The TE should assess whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example, construction of dam in

² Impacts are positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. *Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results based management*. OECD, Development Assistance Committee. For the GEF, environmental impacts are the main focus.

³ Sustainability will be understood as the likelihood of continued benefits after the GEF project ends.

a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralizing the biodiversity related gains made by the project.

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows.

Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability

Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an Unlikely rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than Unlikely, regardless of whether higher ratings in other dimensions of sustainability produce a higher average.

Project monitoring and evaluation system will be rated as follows on each of the dimensions:

Highly Satisfactory (HS): There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Satisfactory(S): There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system

Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The Project had no M&E system.

“M&E plan implementation” will be considered a critical parameter for the overall assessment of the M&E system. The overall rating for the M&E systems will not be higher than the rating on “M&E plan implementation

16.06.2009	1.	Gertrude Lyatuu	Assistant Resident Representative (Energy and Environment)	UNDP
	2.	Bariki Kaale	Programme Analyst	UNDP
18.06.2009	3.	Saleh Pamba	Regional Administrative Secretary	Ruvuma Region Secretariat
	4.	Enock Buja	Regional Natural Resources Advisor	Ruvuma Region Secretariat
19.06.2009	5.	Saveli M. Maketta	District Commissioner	Namtumbo District
	6.	Kenneth Haule	Acting District Executive Director	Namtumbo District Council
20.06.2009	7.	Salumu Kalanje	Village Game Scout	Magazini Village
	8.	Haji Iddi Mapunda	Village Game Scout	Magazini Village
	9.	Iddi amuri Ngunda	Village Game Scout	Magazini Village
	10.	Iddi Selemani Ngumo	Village Game Scout	Magazini Village
	11.	Salumu S Abedi	Village Game Scout	Magazini Village
	12.	Elizabeth N. Hongo	Member	Magazini Village
	13.	Amadi Ligulu	Member	Magazini Village
	14.	Issa Salumu Abedi	Member	Magazini Village
	15.	Nicci Ally	Member	Magazini Village
	16.	Yazidu M. matuma	Member	Magazini Village
	17.	Amina A. Njawala	Member	Magazini Village
	18.	Asha A. Mchimbi	Member	Magazini Village
	19.	Saidi Kapinga	Village Game Scout	Magazini Village
21.06. 2009	20.	Dauda Mohamed	Chairman	Marumba Village
	21.	Mohamed Hussein	Treasurer	Molandi Village
	22.	Mohamedi Mcheni	Assistant Secretary	Molandi Village
	23.	Omari Seifa	Assistant Commandant	Molandi Village
	24.	Mohamedi Bakari	Member	Molandi Village
	25.	Akfima hasani	Member	Molandi Village
	26.	Hadija Issa Mwangelo	Member	Molandi Village
	27.	Hadija Yasini Ndendeule	Member	Marumba Village
	28.	Asigare Moyo	Member	Marumba Village
	29.	Jafari M Kasambi	Village Game Scout	Marumba Village
	30.	Msasa Yasini Kitonye	Village Game Scout	Marumba Village
	31.	Hemedi Huseni	Village Game Scout	Marumba Village
	32.	Musa M. Winogole	Village Game Scout	Molandi Village
	33.	Cama Yahaya	Village Game Scout	Marumba Village

	34.	Selemani Bokamungo	Member	Marumba Village
	35.	Kaunga Mfaume	Member	Marumba Village
	36.	Hassani saidi	Chairman	Marumba Village
	37.	Saidi A Kitonye	Village Executive Officer	Marumba Village
	38.	Ally Msusa Abdlah	Secretary	Kambanda WMA (Mbatamila Village)
	39.	Msenga S.Msenga	Councilor	Marumba Ward
22.06.2009	40.	Peter C. Mtani	Game Officer	Tunduru District Council
	41.	Osteny Mponela	Assistant Forest Officer	Tunduru District Council
	42.	Eusebious C. Ngatunga	District Fisheries Officer	Tunduru District Council
	43.	Eberhard Halla	District Environmental Officer	Tunduru District Council
	44.	Issa A. Ngajime	District Planning Officer	Tunduru District Council
	45.	Damas Masologo	National Team Leader SNWCP Project	Tunduru District Council
		Meeting with Director WD		

Annex 2: List of People Interviewed

List of People and institutions Visited (Not complete names from Namtumbo District council and meeting held at RAS office are missing Khasim Ngomello is following up the matter)

Annex 3: Tentative schedule for the Evaluation

Day	Dates	PLACE	PURPOSE
1	16 th June 09	Arrive DSM	Consultant arrival, meet UNDP and start to review documents and produce brief inception report
2	17 th June	To Songea	Travel DSM to Songea
3	18 th June	Songea/Namtumbo	Meet with RAS Ruvuma Region: continue to Namtumbo,
4	19 th June	To Namtumbo	Meet with DC, DED, Project Team, Meet District Nat Res. Dep, KfW project team, review additional documents

5	20 th June	Namtumbo	Field; Villages and CBO Kimbanda in Lusewa, CBO Kisungule – continue to Marumba/Tunduru –(overnight)
6	21 st June	Tunduru	Field Villages and CBO Chingole, travel to Tunduru town– overnight Tunduru town
7	22 nd June	Tunduru	Meet with DC, DED, Nat Res. Team Tunduru – continue back to Namtumbo
8	23 rd June	Namtumbo	Data Analysis and drafting report, preparation of presentation
9	24 th June	Namtumbo	Presentation to Project Team and proceed to Songea.
10	25 th June	Songea	Presentation to RC/RAS, Members of Steering, and Technical Committee. Feedback and agree on content of report.
11	26 th June.	Songea	Travel Songea to DSM
12-13	27 th to 28 th June	DSM	Weekend
14	29 th	DSM	Provide finding highlights to UNDP/WD
15-20	30 th June to 8 th July	Home office	Consultant to write up report, submit draft report for comments and make final version

Annex 4: References

- Wildlife Policy of Tanzania, March 1998
- National Forest Policy, March 1998
- National Beekeeping Policy, March 1988
- National Land Policy, 1998
- The Wildlife Conservation Act No 12, 1974
- Wildlife Conservation (Wildlife Management Areas) Regulations, 2005
- Guidelines for the designation and management of Wildlife Management Areas in Tanzania
- The Forest Act, 2002 and Subsidiary Legislation
- Community Based Forest Management Guidelines, January 2007
- Fisheries Act No 22 of 2003
- Land Act, May 1999
- Village Land Act 1999
- D. Kaggi, Socioeconomic Baseline Study, March 2006
- U. Bloesch and F. Mavago, Vegetation Study, November 2006
- C. Begg, R. Hahn, N. Madatta, Ruvuma River Study, November 2006 (in electronic copy + animation)
- Chapeyama, O: Mid-Term Evaluation of SNWC Project
- Lenaerts, K: Development of Responsible Tourism Study 2008
- Introduction to the Project-Report to Steering Committee 2008

- Mkwembe, M and Msigwa, P.L: Report on Training of CBOs in SNWC in Entrepreneurship and Business Management Skills 2009
- KfW SNWCCP: Draft Socio economic Survey Report 2009
- Tanzanian Wildlife Research Institute, Draft result aerial census dry season 2006
- TNRF (2006) Wildlife Management Areas in Tanzania: A Status Report and Interim Evaluation: Final Draft.(Nelson, F. *et al*)
- Ireneus N. Ngwatura and Rudolf Hahn, Cross-Border Commuter & Trading Routes in the Selous Niassa Wildlife Corridor, March 2007, draft
- University College for Lands and Architectural Science, UCLAS Dar es Salaam, Report: Training on village land act in project villages, April 2007,
- Training package for villagers on Village Land Act and Regulations (Kiswahili)
- InWent: First Multi-stakeholder workshop - Tanzania, Nov. 2005 in Mtwara
- InWent: Tanzania and Mozambique Cross Border Dialogue, 1st Joint Formal Workshop in Maputo, Mozambique
- InWent: Second Multi-stakeholder workshop – Tanzania, Jan. 2007 in Mtwara
- MoU Crossborder Cooperation TZ/MOZ, March 2007
- FCS, Financial Audit Report, 31st December 2006

Other reports in files:

- Project Docs
- Inception Report, November 2005
- M+E WWF/ World Bank Tracking Tool
- Minutes of Project Steering Committee Meetings (2007 and April 2008)
- Report UNDP project visit, August 2007
- Training Results Village Game Scouts 2006/2007
- Patrol reports village game scouts and joint patrols 2006/2007
- Anti –poaching results and reward scheme 2006/07
- Minutes of cross-border anti-poaching meeting TZ/MOZ, August 2006
- GTZ Internal Audit Report 2008
- Other working papers and reports