

IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION MEMORANDUM (ICM)

A. BASIC TRUST FUND INFORMATION

Most basic information should be automatically linked to SAP TF Master Data and IBTF

TF Name: Novel Forms of Livestock and Wildlife Integration Adjacent to Protected Areas in Africa: Tanzania

TF Number: TF053938

Task Team Leader Name/TF Managing Unit: Christophe Crepin, AFTEN

TF Amount (as committed by donors): USD 880,000

Recipient of TF funds (Bank/Recipient, if Recipient state name of recipient government and implementing agency): FAO for Government of Tanzania

Type of TF (Free-standing/ programmatic/ new TF for an ongoing program): Programmatic

Single/Multi Donor: single donor

Donor(s) Name(s): Global Environment Facility (GEF)

TF Program Source Code: 3356

Purpose of TF (Co-financing/Investment financing/ Debt Service/ Advisory Activities-Bank/Advisory Activities-Recipient, etc): Investment Financing

TF Approval/IBTF Clearance Date: N/A

TF Activation Date: 08/03/2005

TF Closing Date(s): 06/30/2009

Date of ICM Submission to TFO: 10/15/2010

Cost and Financing Table:

Cofinancier	Original	Actual
GEF	880,000	880,000
IBRD/IDA	0	0
Recipient	310,000	310,000
Other	1,149,000	1,149,000
TOTAL	2,339,000	2,339,000

100% of grant funds (USD 880,000) has been disbursed. The final audited accountability reports have been submitted.

All co-financing envisaged at project approval have been met or exceeded. Direct co-financing in-cash and/or in-kind was provided by:

- FAO (USD 71,000) for technical input and knowledge transfer,
- AWF (USD 150,000) for proving logistical support, transportation, facilities, and additional staff time.
- ILRI (USD 110,000) for technical and analytical support and input across all three project components.
- Masaai Advancement Association (MAA) (USD 78,000) for complementary activities related to community capacity building and empowerment.

- Wildlife Division (USD 110,000) for the processes related to WMA designation;
- Livestock Division (USD 60,000) for vaccination campaign to control Rift Valley Fever;
- Simanjiro and Monduli District Council (USD 80,000) for staff supporting land use planning activities, maintaining land registries, and contributing to PCC and PSC meetings.
- Target villages (USD 60,000) for operating land use committees and contributing to the building of the land registry office.

Substantial associated financing was also provided by LEAD (USD 130,000) for complimentary ecosystem studies: transversal study and drought management toolbox and by FFEM (USD 610,000) for the sister project in Chad.

B. TRUST FUND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES AND DESIGN

1. Original (and Revised) Trust Fund Development Objectives

Provide original statement of objectives from the approved/cleared IBTF. If original objectives have been changed, explain the timing and nature of the revisions, their justification and approval authority given.

The goal was to promote conservation of globally significant biodiversity, with improved ecological integrity, conflict resolution, food security and poverty alleviation.

The project objective was to contribute to a significant reduction in conflict over access to resources through the integration of pastoralism, cropping and wildlife conservation through effective policy and institutional change.

The project has been implemented over a period of four years in two districts in Northern Tanzania: Monduli and Simanjiro. The ecosystem involved covers approximately 35,000 km² and includes the Tarangire and Lake Manyara National Parks, the Marang and Esimangor National Forest Reserves and the watershed of the Northern Highland Forest in the Ngorongoro Conservation Area. On the ground, activities were implemented within six selected villages: Lolkisale, Naitolia and Mswakini Juu in Monduli; Loiborsiret, Narakauwo and Loiborsoit A in Simanjiro.

The primary beneficiaries of the project were pastoralists dependent on livestock and/or crops and wild products for their livelihoods.

2. Original (and Revised) Trust Fund Activities/Components

Provide original activities/components to be financed by the Trust Fund. If original activities/components have been changed, identify them, and explain the nature of the revisions, their justification and approving authority.

This project is part of the broader work program of the Livestock, Environment, and Development initiative (LEAD) in the thematic area of livestock-wildlife interactions that is lead by FAO. The Bank has supported the initiative since it started almost 10 years ago. The project aimed to contribute to the conservation of globally significant

biodiversity, through improved ecological integrity, conflict resolution, food security and poverty alleviation. It focused on integrating pastoralism, cropping, and wildlife.

The project design included three main components:

- Component 1: Development, adoption and effective implementation of land use plans.
Aim was to develop and implement participatory land use planning in six selected villages to improve sustainable management of land resources for livestock, wildlife and other land use purposes and to facilitate the establishment of Wildlife Management Areas with full engagement of local communities.
- Component 2: Design and develop benefit-sharing mechanisms through capturing direct and indirect wildlife values.
Aim was to design and implement benefit sharing mechanisms from wildlife such as conservation business ventures with the aim of improving returns from wildlife to communities and to contribute to wildlife conservation.
- Component 3: Development of decision support tools to strengthen rational resource-access and management.
Aim was to develop a decision support tool (DST) by building on input from baseline assessments conducted during project implementation period. Purpose of the DST was to help communities and policy-makers at local and national levels make informed choices regarding land use, business ventures, and public policy in pastoral areas, particularly in the Maasai Steppe and other semi-arid parts of East Africa.

3. Outcome Indicators

*Provide original performance benchmarks to be measured in the assessment of outcome
If none were established, explain why not.*

The achievement of the Project against the original project objective is measured by a composite indicator for the project objective and a set of 8 outcome indicators cutting across the three components (see below). Achievements of the project towards meeting the original project objective is rated Satisfactory. (See detailed indicator ratings in attached Annex 1).

Key Performance Indicator:

1. Novel institutional arrangements are developed and put into place at local level.

Component 1: Development, adoption and effective implementation of land use plans: Outcome Indicators:

1. A significant reduction in conflict over access to resources through the integration of pastoralism, cropping and wildlife conservation through effective policy and institutional change
2. Communities and districts using tools to develop participatory land use plans
3. Plans in use by communities resulting in improved resource allocations

4. Communities involved in Wildlife Management Areas

Component 2: Design and develop benefit-sharing mechanisms through capturing direct and indirect wildlife values - Outcome Indicators:

1. Improved management of wildlife and natural resources, contributing to the increased protection of biodiversity assets
2. Income generating and sustainable uses of biodiversity undertaken by pastoral communities

Component 3: Development of decision support tools to strengthen rational resource-access and management - Outcome Indicators:

1. Policy and decision making support tools and mechanisms designed and in use
2. Sectoral policies and programs at national and regional level take into account the wildlife-livestock interactions

4. Other Significant Changes in Trust Fund Design

Describe and explain the rationale for any changes made in design, scope and scale, implementation arrangements and schedule and funding allocation

1. Design, scope and scale

No significant changes were made to design, scope and scale. All project activities as initially identified and slightly adjusted as per mid-term review have been successfully implemented and completed. The following slight adjustments were made to the project activities during the midterm review:

- Initially, the project aimed to support the establishment of two Wildlife Management Areas (WMA), but during project implementation the two WMAs were merged into one larger WMS (Makuyuni-Lolkisale WMA) and the target was revised to one WMA accordingly.
- Initially, the project aimed to support the creation of 3 Conservation Business Ventures (CBVs), but the target was revised to 1 CBV due to lack of viable business groups.
- All modeling and analytical work were consolidated into one comprehensive tool kit (i.e. Decision Support Tool) to enhance dissemination and knowledge activities.

All of the above changes were endorsed by the project steering committee (PSC) and the World Bank.

2. Implementation arrangements

No changes were made with regard to the implementation arrangements.

3. Implementation schedule

Original project implementation period stipulated in the project document was three years starting 2004 to 2007. With the initial delays at the onset of the project due to political reasons (national elections), natural calamity (a prolonged drought in 2005), and other issues related to official bureaucracy, effective implementation of activities did not commence until December 2005. Consequently a one-year extension was granted for the period December 31, 2007 to December 31, 2008 in order to bring the project up to the

three years initially granted. A second 6-month extension until June 30 2009 was granted to permit the completion of an Environmental Impact Assessment, which was necessary prior to a potential additional investment, that had been identified later during project implementation as part of village land use planning activities .

4. Funding reallocation

Minimal reallocation of funds among original disbursement categories was undertaken as specified below:

- a) An increase of US\$ 2 000 from category 1 (Goods) (2.2% of initial amount)
- b) A reduction of US\$ 42 000 from category 2 (Consultant services) (7.6% of initial amount)
- C) An increase of US\$ 40 000 for category 3 (Training, workshops and conference) (25.0% of initial amount)

The reallocation from category 2 to categories 1 and 3 was undertaken because the project did not foresee any major future expenses against this category.

C. OUTCOME

1. Relevance of TF Objectives, Design and Implementation

Discuss how the Trust Fund objectives, design and implementation are proved relevant to current global/regional/country priorities and the Bank's sector strategy

Global priorities

The project was in line with the global objectives and priorities to promote conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in environmentally vulnerable areas such as arid-and semi-arid areas characterized by high biodiversity of global significance. By contributing to better land use planning, support to development of wildlife management areas and benefit-sharing mechanisms, the project has contributed to achieving global goals aimed at the conservation of global environmental benefits such as biodiversity.

Regional priorities

At regional level the project is in-line with the African Union's Pastoral Policy Framework that among other objectives aims at defining practical approaches for improving the ability of pastoral societies to manage extreme environmental variability, reducing the vulnerability of pastoral people to climatic shock, and to conflict.

Country priorities

The project was consistent with Tanzania's National Strategy for Growth and Poverty Reduction (NSGRP)/MKUKUTA. The project contributed towards meeting various targets set out in the strategy on promoting sustainable and broad-based growth, reduction of income poverty and reduction in vulnerability from environmental risk by: (1) reducing negative impacts on environment and people's livelihoods; (2) reducing land degradation and loss of biodiversity; (3) implementation of land use and management plans; (4) increased growth rate for the livestock sector through promotion of efficient utilization of rangelands and recognition of pastoralism as a sustainable livelihood system; (5) development of programmes for increasing local control and earnings from Wildlife Management Areas.

The project was also in-line with several Tanzania's priorities and aspirations expressed through policy frameworks such as the National Land Policy and Land Act (1997), the Village Land Act (1999), the Wildlife Policy of Tanzania (1998); the National Agricultural and Livestock Policy of Tanzania (1997).

Bank's Sector Strategy

The Project was consistent with the Joint Assistance Strategy for Tanzania (JAS). The JAS is a framework document developed by the development partner group and the Government in support of the Government's development and poverty reduction goals as presented in the MUKUKUTA (see above).

2. Achievement of TF Development Objective

Discuss and rate the extent to which the Trust Fund development objectives have been met, with linkage to outcome indicators. This includes an assessment as to whether the actual output/deliverables were successfully completed, compared to the expected output, for each activity/component of the Trust Fund. For activities where the output is a report or a dissemination event such as a workshop, conference, training, or study tour, discuss and rate the Quality, Presentation and Dissemination. Applicable reports and/or documents are to be attached to the ICM

The project objective of "a significant reduction in conflict over access to resources through the integration of pastoralism, cropping and wildlife conservation through effective policy and institutional change" is measured against a composite indicator. This composite indicator combines four *key institutional and policy changes – all of which have been achieved:*

- *Six villages land use planning groups have been established and are operating.*
- *Two District land use planning fora have been established and are active.*
- *Two community groups support the development of WMAs. (Two WMA eventually merged into one larger WMA).*
- *Community group benefitting from the development of Community Based Ventures (CBVs).*

Outcome Analysis as per Outcome Indicators

1.1. A significant reduction in conflict over access to resources through the integration of pastoralism, cropping and wildlife conservation

Rated: MODERATELY ACHIEVED. Stabilization of conflict levels between wildlife and agriculture/livestock; reduction of conflicts between Tarangire National Park and bordering villages involved in the project; and institutional mechanisms in place to resolve conflicts over village boundaries.

Date: 06/30/2009

1.2. Communities and districts using tools to develop participatory land use plans

Rated: FULLY ACHIEVED. District officers were trained to use the <Opportunities & Obstacles For Development Tool> and have applied the methodology in the 6 villages and 2 districts. As a result, six Land Use Plans were developed. District Officers have been trained in the use of the GIS and maps have been developed.

Date: 06/30/2009

1.3. Plans in use by communities resulting in improved resource allocations.

Rated: FULLY ACHIEVED. Land use plans are developed in the 6 selected villages. Land use changes observed as result of land use plan implementation.

Date: 06/30/2009

1. 4 Communities actively involved in WMAs

Rated: FULLY ACHIEVED. A joint pilot WMA Makuyuni-Lokisale has been established and has received endorsement from Ministry of Natural Resources. The WMA combines Lokisale as well as the additional Makuyuni into one combined WMA (instead of two previously identified WMAs). Community based organization in place for the management of the WMA.

Date: 06/30/2009

2.1. Improved management of wildlife and natural resources, contributing to the increased protection of biodiversity assets.

Rated: MODERATELY ACHIEVED. Land Use Plans enforced in the 6 villages improve the use of natural resource. WMA and CBVs developed support wildlife conservation. Awareness raising and training workshops carried out on a regular basis.

Date: 06/30/2009

2.2. Income-generating and sustainable uses of biodiversity undertaken by pastoral communities

Rated: MODERATELY ACHIEVED. A partnership has with a US investor has been established for a women's group of craft makers. Business plans have been developed in the WMA for potential ventures on walking safaris, lodges with involvement of the private sector, and bee-keeping. Given the scale and timeframe of the project, no significant trends could be captured by the household survey. **Date:** 06/30/2009

3. 1. Policy and decision making support tools and mechanisms designed and in use

Rated: FULLY ACHIEVED. A comprehensive DST is available in English as well as Swahili and has been introduced at a launching event in to sectoral ministries. Dissemination of 200 additional English copies and 300 Swahili copies

as per dissemination plan. District Officers have been trained in the use of the DST.

Date: 06/30/2009

3.2. Sectoral policies and programs at national and regional level take into account wildlife-livestock interactions

Rated: MODERATELY ACHIEVED. Policy note has been prepared, presented and discussed at national and district level. Strategy on wildlife-livestock health management has been disseminated and is further promoted by local NGO.

Date: 06/30/2009

Output Analysis by Component

Component 1. Development, adoption and effective implementation of land use plans and wildlife management areas

Implementation Rating: Satisfactory

Status: Completed

Planned Output: Participatory Land Use Plans (LUPs) and Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) developed, adopted and implemented.

Actual Output: Six land use plans for the target villages were developed and approved. Village and district level stakeholders have benefited from training and capacity building activities. At village level, capacity has been built for participatory land use planning, conflict mediation and resolution of land use disputes, and monitoring of land use patterns. In addition, a village land registry has been established in Naitolya village. At district level, training has been provided for GIS in support of land use planning and mapping. A land registry has been established at the Monduli District capturing all land-related data and serving as a tool to resolve land disputes. A Wildlife Management Areas has been established consolidating 2 initially separate pilot WMAs. The WMA comprises 4 villages: Lokisale, Naitolya, Msawkini Juu and Makuyuni.

Component 2. Design and development of benefit sharing mechanisms through capturing direct and indirect wildlife values

Implementation Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

Status: Completed

Planned Output: Innovative mechanisms to harness wildlife value designed

Actual Output: Business planning exercises including resource assessments, market potential and identification of business venture opportunities have been carried out and are aimed to attract further interest from potential investors. The project supported the establishment of a Conservation Business Venture (CBV) that comprises 30 women engaged in handcraft making, who have signed an enterprise contract with a US firm. Further, crop/livestock/wildlife conflict-

analysis and a household survey were carried out to assess livelihood strategies of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in the project area.

Despite tangible achievements, the establishment of further CBVs (Conservation Business Ventures, such as tourism enterprises) was beyond the project's scope, focus and above resource envelope. The project thus focused its effort on supporting a single CBV and supporting business planning exercise and

The major impact under this component relates to the changes in communities' perceptions and attitudes towards wildlife. The sensitization and awareness process carried out by the project has been instrumental in improving community perceptions towards the utilization of wildlife as a potential alternative source of income and livelihood sustenance.

Component 3. Development of decision support tools to strengthen rational resource-access and management

Implementation Rating: Highly Satisfactory

Status: Completed

Planned Output: Decision support tools (DSTs) to strengthen rational resource access and management developed

Actual Output: Tools were developed to address the four priority areas where support was needed as identified in baseline assessments: land use planning and management, benefit sharing mechanisms, conflict management, and wildlife-livestock diseases. Tools were published in a Decision Support Tool (DST) titled "Sustaining communities, livestock and wildlife: A guide to participatory land use planning" and disseminated in two languages (200 hard copies in English and 300 hard copies Swahili). Based on lessons learned from complementary activities in a sister project in CHAD, all decision-support related activities were consolidated into the development of the Decision Support Tool (DST), which was externally reviewed and widely disseminated.. Further, a Policy brief "Sustaining communities, livestock and wildlife in the Maasai Steppe: Vital facts, observations and positive policy actions" was developed to inform national decision makers on key issues emerging from project implementation within the project area and raise awareness on issues related to wildlife-livestock interactions.

Major impacts under this component has been the creation of a coalition of partners, including government, private sector, civil society, and community representatives that jointly improve coordination of development initiatives related to wildlife and livestock in the Tarangire-Lake Manyara Ecosystem and facilitate knowledge exchange amongst the different stakeholders.

Comment on planned and actual Output:

All project outputs have been achieved in line with some small revisions to targets at mid-term review. For example: The target of establishing two WMAs was revised to one joint WMA, as the villages joined to form a larger consolidated WMA. Further, the project target of establishing 3 CBVs was reduced to 1 CBV taking into account the project's timeframe and resource envelope. Although additional CBVs were identified and supported with complementary financing, they are outside the target area of the six villages supported under this project.

Although all originally planned project activities have been achieved, an additional planned investment, which was identified later during project implementation and aimed to improve water access for Naitolya village, was not achieved. Improved water access was prioritized in the local land use plan and would have involved desilting of an existing water hole and stabilization of the embankment. The project ambitiously embarked on carrying out this additional investment. However, due to various reasons the investment was eventually not possible to achieve within the timeframe and resource envelope of the project. A lengthy safeguard clearance process including an Environmental Impact Assessment delayed the investment. Further, due to overly precautionous and costly mitigation measures proposed by the EIA, the investment eventually increased beyond the allocated budget envelope provided for by project. In consultation with the beneficiary village, the investment was dropped and funds were reallocated to alternative activities prioritized in the land use plan, i.e. related to resolution of conflict over village boundaries.

3. Efficiency

Describe the degree to which the Trust Fund activities have been efficiently implemented, in terms of their associated costs, implementation times and economic and financial returns.

The Project can demonstrate efficiency through attainment of all expected results considering the objectives previously set. All, trainings were delivered, all tools developed, and all land use planning-related activities carried out. The partners selected for project implementation all have a competitive advantage in their area of expertise and were thus able to deliver effectively. For example, FAO could draw on knowledge and experiences elsewhere around the world for development of the Decision Support Tool for "Sustaining Communities, Livestock and Wildlife – A Guide to Participatory Land Use Planning", while ILRI could provide the necessary analytical input needed to make the tool highly relevant for the Tanzanian savanna ecosystem. AWF could build on a long history of community outreach and presence on the ground to build the trust necessary to effectively engage communities in land use planning and new approaches to livestock and wildlife integration.

4. Development Impacts, including those that are Unintended/Unrelated to TF Objectives

Discuss all other outcomes and impacts achieved under the Trust Fund (including unintended, positive and negative). Where relevant, discuss how the Trust Fund has

contributed to the development/strengthening of relevant institutions, mobilization of other resources, knowledge exchange, recipient policy/program implementation, replicable best practices, introduction of new products, New Forms of Cooperation with Other Development Institutions/NGOs, etc., which would not have been achieved in the absence of the Trust Fund.

1. *Institutional strengthening and change:* The project has strengthened institutional capacity at the district and village level for land use planning and natural resource management, in particular with view to livestock and wildlife integration. Moreover, it has strengthened collaboration between national and local level government staff, NGOs, the private sector and local communities by supporting the establishment of a forum that brought different stakeholders together. Some examples of institutional strengthening include project's support to:
 - Establishment of Land Use Fora at district level for overseeing land issues, for providing a forum for exchange of views and experiences, as well as conflict resolution; Land use fora comprise of a multitude of stakeholders including public sector (sectoral line ministries, local government, sectoral agencies), private sector (Hunting Companies, Miners, Private Large Scale Farmers), NGOs, and local community representatives.
 - Capacity building at district level through training in land use planning and the use of appropriate methodological tools; capacity building through support to two graduate studentships from a national institution (Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism) and NGO (African Wildlife Foundation)
 - Support to the bi-annual Tarangire-Manyara ecosystem forum consisting of both governments and non-governmental organizations working within the Tarangire-Manyara ecosystem.
2. *New forms of cooperation with other development institutions/NGOs:* The project brought together a diverse number of stakeholders with diverse interests enabling new forms of cooperation among these groups and facilitated the coordination of land use planning efforts among different stakeholders. New forms of cooperation was enhanced through the:
 - establishment of land use fora that comprises of a multitude of stakeholders including local communities, Hunting Companies, Miners, Private Large Scale Farmers, TANAPA, Local NGOs, government representatives, etc.
 - support to the bi-annual Tarangire-Manyara ecosystem consisting of both governments and non-governmental organizations working within the Tarangire-Manyara ecosystem.
3. *Knowledge Exchange:* Knowledge transfer has been facilitated at several levels: (i) through dissemination of knowledge generated by the project such as lessons learned, methodologies developed and experiences through the decision support tools; (ii) by creation of discussion forums, such as the district land use fora and the Tarangire-Manyara ecosystem forum that eases dialogue and aids knowledge exchange between decision-makers and other key stakeholders; and (iii) by support to study tours outside the project area (e.g. study visit of newly established Lolikisale-

Makuyuni pilot WMA to well-established Enduimet WMA). At regional level, the project has been involved in a regional workshop on conflict over water and land resources.

4. *Introduction of new products:* Development of a decision support tool on participatory land use planning that links land use planning to other related issues such as benefit sharing mechanisms, conflict management and wildlife-livestock diseases.

Other unintended outcomes

Demand for land use planning from villages outside the project site: There has been an expressed demand for land use planning from adjoining villages within the two districts. These villages will therefore benefit from the experience, expertise and institutional setup established in the six project villages.

Gender issues: The project has empowered women through its support to the CBV "Loiborsoit A" Women's Group and assistance to widows in Loboisiret village to obtain land titles hence securing land tenure.

5. Overall TF Outcome

Justification for overall outcome rating, taking into account the Trust Fund's relevance, achievement of each TF development objectives, efficiency and development impact. (Rating Scale would be consistent with the six point scale used in ISR/ICR: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU))

Overall project outcome rating is **Satisfactory**.

The Project objective has been achieved and expected outcomes have been met. The project contributed to improved land use management, conflict resolution, and livelihood benefits by focusing on the integration of pastoralism, cropping, and wildlife. The Project built capacity at local and district level for sustainable land use with the aim to limit uncontrolled expansion of non-viable agriculture into semi-arid and marginal lands with limited suitability of crop production, but of high importance for wildlife conservation. The project further supported pastoral livelihoods, which are compatible with wildlife conservation. Tangible benefits from wildlife can serve as an incentive for pastoralists to tolerate the cost associated with the integration of wildlife and livestock. The project further demonstrated that WMAs are important evolving mechanisms to empower local communities to manage their land more sustainably, to resolve conflicts over natural resources access, and to eventually benefit from wildlife-based business ventures.

At the beginning of the project no institutional arrangements were in place to reduce the conflict over access to resources through the integration of pastoralism, cropping and wildlife conservation, as stipulated in the project objective. At the end of the project the

following key institutional and policy changes have been put in place:

- Six villages land use planning groups have been established and are operating.
- Two District land use planning fora have been established and are active.
- Two community groups support the development of WMAs. (Two WMA eventually merged into one larger WMA).
- Community group benefitting from the development of Community Based Ventures (CBVs).

Provide results framework or indicators provided by the M&E system (including baseline and actual).

Please refer to Annex 1 (outcome Indicator Framework) and 2 (Results by Activity).

D. Risk to Development Outcome

1. Follow-On Results and/or Investment Activities

Identify and provide a description of the role played by this TF that led to those follow-up activities or investments checked below. (Check all that are applicable):

Activity/Investment:

_____ Recipient/Other Investment; ☒ Grant Project/Program; _____ Bank Project; _____ IFC Financial Project/Activity, Other (explain)

2. Replicability

Describe and rate the extent to which the Trust Fund has generated useful lessons and methodology that are replicable in other sectors and/or regions.

The Decision Support Tool titled: Sustaining communities, livestock and wildlife – a guide to participatory land-use planning, provides an ideal tool to scale up land use planning throughout further villages in the Tarangire-Lake Manyara Ecosystem, as well as in the wider region. The project's focus on knowledge exchange and dissemination provides substantial potential for replication of successful project activities. The trust fund has further generated a series of lessons applicable in similar ecosystems (see section F).

3. Overall Risk to Development Outcome

Rate how likely, and for how long, the outcomes will be sustained after completion of Trust Fund activities, and the likelihood that some changes may occur that are detrimental to the achievement of the TF development objectives. These may include factors such as technical, financial, economic, social, political, environmental, government ownership/commitment, other stakeholder ownership, institutional support, governance and natural disasters exposure. (Rating Scale would be consistent with the four point scale used in ISR/ICR: Negligible to Low (L), Moderate (M), Significant (S) and High (H))

Rating: Moderate

The project has achieved tangible results on the ground, in particular related to participatory land use planning and conflict resolution over access to natural resources in the target villages and Wildlife Management Area supported by the project. These project outcomes are likely to be sustained after project completion. Major features that will contribute to the sustainability of project results include: capacity building and institutional development for participatory land use planning, establishment of land registries, and development and dissemination of the Decision Support Tool. The participatory approach adopted by the project and the continuous involvement of project beneficiaries and other stakeholders, i.e. through the establishment of multi-stakeholder fora at local and district level, further support ownership of project achievements.

However, at larger ecosystem level, the overall downward trend of wildlife, one of Tanzania's important resources and basis for the economically important tourism industry, continues. Key factor for the dwindling wildlife is uncontrolled land conversion and agricultural expansion into important wildlife corridors as well as into dispersal areas for wildlife grazing and calving outside protected areas. Yet, agricultural expansion into these semi-arid areas traditionally occupied only by wildlife and pastoralists is highly exposed to climate variability risks and mostly not sustainable given the constraints of soil fertility in these semi-arid lands. Consequently, a larger effort to scale up sustainable land management activities and results to the landscape level is necessary to achieve biodiversity and other global environmental goals at the ecosystem level.

E. PERFORMANCE

1. Bank

Rate and justify rating on how well the Bank carried out its specific responsibilities assumed under the Trust Fund. If the TF financed Secretariat functions, describe how well the Secretariat carried out its roles and responsibilities, and its exit strategy, if any. If the Bank is executing Recipient work on behalf of Recipient, describe how well the rationale for Bank execution (as specified in the IBTF) was realized. (Rating Scale would be consistent with the six point scale used in ISR/ICR: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU))

(a) Executing Agency

Rating: Satisfactory

FAO has been the executing agency of this project on behalf of the World Bank (under the GEF's interim arrangements for other Implementation Agencies with no direct access to GEF). The main roles of FAO comprised of provision of technical input through FAO's Livestock, Environment and Development (LEAD) Initiative; the oversight of procurement, financial management and M&E; and overall coordination and supervision of local implementation agencies. FAO has maintained a highly qualified administrative and technical team that has been actively involved in the project right from design to completion. There has been close oversight and continuous guidance provided throughout the project. On many occasions, during the course of implementation, FAO went beyond its affirmed roles a feature that has ultimately resulted in a successful completion of the project.

2. Recipient (for Recipient-executed TFs only)

Rate and justify rating on how well the different tasks that were expected from the Recipient under this Trust Fund were carried out. (Rating Scale would be consistent with the six point scale used in ISR/ICR: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU))

Note on Grant recipients:

The recipient of the grant was FAO, with the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) and the African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) serving as sub-recipients. The role of FAO was to provide technical support utilizing in-house expertise and knowledge generated from the LEAD Initiative in the development and implementation of the project as well as administrative and operational support and assistance to monitoring and evaluation of the project. The African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) was responsible for the on-the-ground co-ordination and implementation of project activities, under the supervision of the FAO. The International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) was responsible for providing scientific and analytic support to the design of various activities and tools.

No legal agreement was entered into directly with the Government of Tanzania, however line ministries provided policy guidance to the project and local governments have been closely involved in the implementation of the project activities on the ground.

(a) Government Performance

Rating: Satisfactory

There was adequate support, contribution and participation from the Government of Tanzania - represented mainly through the Project Steering Committee - during implementation. Additional support was provided from district staff for on-the-ground activities.

(b) Local Implementing Agencies' Performance

Rating: Satisfactory

Two institutions – the African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) and International Research Institute (ILRI) contributed significantly to the implementation of the project. AWF was responsible for local co-ordination and execution of the project activities and ILRI for providing scientific support to the design of methodologies for various activities. Both organizations brought with them distinct forms of expertise - fundamental to overall project implementation and achievement of project outcomes. Both partners (AWF, ILRI) respected their financial commitments in-cash and in-kind.

F. LESSONS LEARNED / RECOMMENDATIONS

Describe the most significant positive and negative lessons learned from the success or failure of the grant activity and, as appropriate, make constructive recommendations for each stakeholder involved (Donor/Bank/Recipient/Development Community)—based on the assumption these stakeholders might decide to undertake a similar activity at a future time.

FAO-LEAD played an important role in connecting the project to other regional activities and enabling cross-fertilisation. The project was identified and formulated as part of the Livestock Environment and Development (LEAD¹) initiative in the thematic area of livestock-wildlife interactions. Through the LEAD initiative FAO ensured the exchange of experiences and information between the project and other similar projects implemented under the LEAD initiative with support of other donors in the region. For example, knowledge exchanges were initiated with a sister project in Chad as part of a regional study on pastoralist's access to natural resources and related conflicts. The LEAD initiative also used its Steering Committee, network of institutions and website to share projects results and receive complementary guidance.

The strength of the project, which by design had a strong emphasis on knowledge creation and exchange, as well building capacity, may also have been one of its weaknesses in terms of livelihoods impact that could be achieved on the ground. While substantial achievements were made with view to sustainable land use planning in target areas, limited emphasis and investments were placed on enhancing or diversifying rural livelihoods.

Advantages and disadvantages of a multi-layered grant recipient structure. FAO was the grant recipient for GEF resources, while the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) and the African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) were sub-recipients. Project implementation was carried out by FAO, ILRI, and AWF, with ILRI and AWF accountable to FAO, and FAO accountable to the World Bank for overall implementation progress. Although no legal agreement was entered into directly with the Government of Tanzania, the project has closely involved district governments and line ministries in the implementation of the project activities. The multi-tiered grant recipient structure added an additional layer to the project management and accountability structure, which in some cases created extra burden on budget and administration. However, this was largely compensated by the technical input provided by FAO, which was significantly higher than originally included in the project budget.

Lessons learned related to conceptual approach:

Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) continue to present the most relevant approach to sustain wildlife outside protected areas and improve community livelihoods. WMAs support pastoralist livelihoods and livestock, which in contrast to agriculture are compatible with wildlife conservation. Pastoralism is also the most appropriate land use for the semi-arid landscape of the Masaai Steppe, where agricultural

¹ A multi-donor initiative with its secretariat at FAO-AGA and its Chairperson at the World Bank – HQ.

expansion is not sustainable and highly susceptible to climate variability. Sustainable land use planning within WMAs limits the expansion of agriculture into areas important for wildlife migration and dispersal and/or marginal lands. Since WMAs mobilize several adjacent villages towards a common land management goal, land use planning is further elevated from the unit of the village level to a higher landscape level, which is important to avoid fragmented land use patterns that reduce or obstruct important wildlife migration paths, calving areas, grazing grounds and other dispersal areas. Furthermore, by joining several villages and their associated land resources, WMAs as a unit are more attractive to investors than several individual villages and thus provide better opportunities for realization of alternative sources of income for communities. With a joint benefit-sharing agreement in place that includes all villages, a WMA also prevents a race-to-the-bottom competition between villages in an effort to attract investors and eventually reduces conflict amongst villages. Lastly, land use planning within a WMA allows movement of pastoralists over a larger unit and provides more mobility for herds to adapt to pasture conditions, water availability, and other factors.

While Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) can serve as an important evolving mechanism to allow local communities to plan and manage their land and associated natural resources, benefit from wildlife through the establishment of wildlife-based business ventures, as well as solve conflicts over natural resources, a fully conducive policy, legal and regulatory framework is not yet in place. The current regulatory and legal framework is not fully conducive to the originally intended goal of WMAs to empower communities and confer control over wildlife resources directly to communities. Regulation introduced in 2007 stipulates that the Wildlife Division of MNRT collects revenue from wildlife-based revenue generated inside WMAs on behalf of the communities for subsequent redistribution of a 65% share back to the community, 15% back to the District, while the remaining 20% are retained at central level. While most communities consider these revenue sharing percentages as fair, communities request powers to collect their share of benefits directly from the investors rather than funds being channeled through the central government. Before entering into a contract with a private investor, communities organized in WMAs are further required to obtain review and approval from central government (Wildlife Division, MNRT) on the terms of the contracts. While the intended purpose of this clearance step is to ensure fairness of the contract conditions for the communities, it also creates delays for finalization of contract agreements, and creates the risk of potential conflict of interest by the approving central authority (i.e. if a investor decides to invest in a WMA just outside the National Park rather than inside the NP). Lastly, the process of creating a WMA according to current law is time consuming, cumbersome, and costly, thus posing a significant bureaucratic and financial barrier for local communities to carry the process forward without substantial external support. A streamlined, much simpler process for establishing WMAs is needed if this model is to be up scaled for more areas of importance for wildlife conservation throughout the country. At present, the above-mentioned factors reduce community ownership of WMAs and discourage community expectations with view to potential economic benefits.

Lessons learned related to project implementation process and community engagement:

Importance to place a priority on gradually building community trust to overcome distrust and misperceptions attached to government-led efforts towards community empowerment. Many groups of Masaai in remote rural areas have been marginalized during past decades and have lost access to valuable land on which to graze livestock as a result of an increasing network of National Parks and protected areas. Consequently, a lengthy, carefully managed, and highly participatory engagement process was necessary to dissolve distrust in the concept of WMAs and attached fears of further loss of land access. Considerable outreach was also necessary to raise awareness on the opportunities WMAs offer in terms of community empowerment. Mobilizing communities to form WMAs and engage in sustainable land use planning of communal and private land towards the joint objective of livestock and wildlife integration thus has to be understood as a longer-term process that requires substantive awareness raising and capacity building input at local as well as district levels.

Raising the visibility of non-economic benefits during early stages of WMA establishment is important to manage expectations of communities and maintain momentum. Taking into account the considerable time needed to invest in laying the foundations of a WMA, a key lesson is to carefully manage community expectations related to benefits that can be realized within the short- and medium term. Experience has shown that it may take considerable time until tangible economic benefits can be achieved at community level or even at household level. Therefore, it is crucial to build community understanding and recognition of non-economic benefits, such as improved community decision-making structures, reduced conflict over resources, secured land title certification, as well as other social benefits. Raising visibility of such benefits early on has proven essential to maintain community support and momentum for WMAs in the early stages. Nevertheless, realization of tangible economic benefits is important for sustained community support over the long-term. Business planning exercises including resource assessments and identification of economic opportunities have been carried out with support by AWF and proven an important tool to jump-start interest by potential private investors. While conservation based ventures have been established with support of AWF in different WMAs over the last decade, the relatively short 4-year implementation period of the project did not allow sufficient time to achieve wildlife-based ventures and realize substantial economic return to pastoralist in the target communities of the project. Continued support to WMAs will be necessary to ensure their long-term sustainability, as communities continue to bear the price of losing livestock and crops as a result of sharing rangeland and productive lands with wildlife.

Efforts to form and strengthen a coalition of stakeholders in support of integrated land use planning have been essential to promote a joint agenda. Different stakeholder groups, including business venture groups holding hunting concessions, national park services, as well as communities organized in WMAs (or organized in informal groups) currently all compete for benefits that can be generated from wildlife. While hunting venture groups as well as the Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA) have access to policy makers and national and local government decision-making processes, rural community groups in the past have not been adequately organized to take part and significantly influence policy development related to wildlife

conservation and associated revenue streams – despite the Wildlife Policy conferring control over wildlife resources and resulting benefits to the community. The project has supported efforts to organize designated WMAs, so called Authorized Associations, in a Consortium of AAs, that will serve to represent the interests of communities that strive to conserve wildlife based on an integrated approach with livestock production. Further support for strengthening a common understanding of an integrated land management approach is provided by a larger stakeholder forum that includes NGOs, CBOs, and other relevant interest groups, such as Masaai Associations. Building capacity of local stakeholders to promote shared interests in issues related to wildlife conservation, improvement of rural livelihoods, in particular pastoralism, and strengthening integrated land use management at the landscape level, has proven to increase overall project impact.

If environmental safeguard mitigation measures are not applied sensibly, they can derail important investment activities that are crucial for community development impacts of the project. During in the course of project implementation, beneficiaries prioritized the rehabilitation of the Naitolya Charco Dam as a key investment to improve water access for domestic use, livestock, as well as wildlife use. Consequently, funds were committed for prioritized investments as per land use plans that were developed with support of the project. However, the nature of the investment triggered the World Bank's safeguard policy on Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01) in line with applicable Environment Management legislation of Tanzania. Accordingly, the requisite site-specific EIA was carried out. A chain of events however eventually resulted in the need to drop the investment altogether and as a consequence left affected beneficiaries without improved access to water, disappointed in project outcomes, and skeptical of the application of environmental safeguard requirements. First, it is arguable whether the scope of the investment – essentially the desilting of a shallow and small existing water pond –indeed required an EIA or whether the precautionary approach was overrated in this particular case. Second, the EIA produced by an independent expert and approved by NEMC was arguably over-ambitious in terms of recommended mitigation measures and went beyond environmental and social concerns implying doubled investment costs, which were not manageable within the limited investment envelope for works under the project.

Main recommendations to stakeholders:

Simanjiro and Monduli District, both having received significant training and capacity building are in an ideal position to scale up participatory land use planning efforts across a larger number of villages, in particular that various tools, such as the Swahili version of the DST, are now available. Continued support from the larger forum of stakeholders, including NGOs, line ministries, sectoral agencies, research institutions, and private sector will be important to maintain the momentum.

G. ICM PROCESSING AND COMMENTS

1. Preparation

TTL at Approval: Christophe Crepin

TTL at Closing: Christophe Crepin

Comment of TTL at Closing: This GEF grant enabled a good partnership with FAO and the Government of Tanzania in the context of the multi-partner LEAD initiative (environment and livestock). Some good knowledge has been generated which can be used for replication.

Prepared by (if other than TTL): Nina Doetinchem

Date Submitted to Approving Manager: March 16, 2011

2. Approval

Manager: Idah Pswarayi Riddihough, Sector Manager, AFTEN

Date Approved by Manager: March 17, 2011

Manager's Comment:

1PR

3. TFO Evaluation of ICM Quality

TFO Reviewer:

TFO Rating on the Quality of ICM (*Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory*):

Comment and Justification for Rating Given by TFO: