

Document of  
The World Bank

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Report No: 28382

IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION REPORT  
(TF-28483)

ON A

GRANT

IN THE AMOUNT OF US\$ 5 MILLION

TO THE REPUBLIC OF

MOZAMBIQUE

FOR A

TRANSFRONTIER CONSERVATION AREAS PILOT  
AND INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING PROJECT

March 31, 2004

Environmental, Rural and Social Development Unit - Southern Africa (AFTS1)  
**Africa Region**

This document has a restricted distribution and may be used by recipients only in the performance of their official duties. Its contents may not otherwise be disclosed without World Bank authorization.

## CURRENCY EQUIVALENTS

(Exchange Rate Effective on March 30th, 2004)

Currency Unit = Meticais  
1 MZM = US\$ 0.000043  
US\$ 1 = 23,250 MZM

## FISCAL YEAR

January 1 to December 31

## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CAMPFIRE	Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources
CAS	Country Assistance Strategy
CBNRM	Community-Based Natural Resource Management
COUTADA	Hunting Concession
DINAGECA	National Directorate for Geography and Cadastre (MADER)
DNAC	National Directorate of Conservation Areas (MITUR)
DNFFB	National Directorate for Forestry and Wildlife (MADER)
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS/EIS	Geographical/Environmental Information System
GLNP	Great Limpopo National Park
GOM	Government of Mozambique
ICB	International Competitive Bidding
ICR	Implementation Completion Report
IFC	International Finance Corporation
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
JMC	Joint Management Committee
KfW	German Development Bank
KNP	Kruger National Park
LNP	Limpopo National Park
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MADER	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
MER	Maputo Elephant Reserve
MICOA	Ministry for Coordination of Environmental Affairs
MITUR	Ministry of Tourism
NCB	National Competitive Bidding
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NRM	Natural Resource Management
PA	Protected Area
PAD	Project Appraisal Document
PIP	Project Implementation Plan
PPF	Project Preparation Facility
PSR	Project Supervision Report
QAG	Quality Assurance Group

SADC Southern Africa Development Committee  
SDC Swiss Development Corporation  
SDR Special Drawing Rights  
SPFFB Provincial Forestry and Wildlife Services (MADER)  
SC Steering Committee  
TC Technical Committee  
TFCA Transfrontier Conservation Areas  
TFCATDP Transfrontier Conservation Areas and Tourism Development Project  
TTL Task Team Leader  
UEM University of Edward Mondlane  
USAID United States Agency for International Development  
WWF Worldwide Fund for Nature

Vice President:	Callisto E. Madavo
Country Director:	Darius Mans
Sector Manager:	Richard G. Scobey
Task Team Leader:	Agnes I. Kiss

**MOZAMBIQUE**  
**Transfrontier Conservation Areas Pilot and Institutional Strengthening Project**

**CONTENTS**

	<b>Page No.</b>
1. Project Data	1
2. Principal Performance Ratings	1
3. Assessment of Development Objective and Design, and of Quality at Entry	2
4. Achievement of Objective and Outputs	5
5. Major Factors Affecting Implementation and Outcome	10
6. Sustainability	12
7. Bank and Borrower Performance	13
8. Lessons Learned	15
9. Partner Comments	17
10. Additional Information	17
Annex 1. Key Performance Indicators/Log Frame Matrix	18
Annex 2. Project Costs and Financing	25
Annex 3. Economic Costs and Benefits	27
Annex 4. Bank Inputs	28
Annex 5. Ratings for Achievement of Objectives/Outputs of Components	30
Annex 6. Ratings of Bank and Borrower Performance	31
Annex 7. List of Supporting Documents	32
Annex 8. Borrower's Project Completion Report	33
Annex 9. GEF additional requirements	45

<i>Project ID:</i> P001759	<i>Project Name:</i> Transfrontier Conservation Areas Pilot and Institutional Strengthening Project
<i>Team Leader:</i> Michael John Webster	<i>TL Unit:</i> YPP
<i>ICR Type:</i> Core ICR	<i>Report Date:</i> March 31, 2004

## 1. Project Data

*Name:* Transfrontier Conservation Areas Pilot and Institutional Strengthening Project      *L/C/TF Number:* TF-28483

*Country/Department:* MOZAMBIQUE      *Region:* Africa Regional Office

*Sector/subsector:* Other social services (48%); Central government administration (21%); Sub-national government administration (19%); Forestry (12%)

*Theme:* Biodiversity (P); Other environment and natural resources management (P); Participation and civic engagement (S)

### KEY DATES

	<i>Original</i>	<i>Revised/Actual</i>
<i>PCD:</i> 05/21/1996	<i>Effective:</i> 05/21/1997	05/21/1997
<i>Appraisal:</i> 06/28/1996	<i>MTR:</i> 10/01/1999	12/28/2000
<i>Approval:</i> 12/12/1996	<i>Closing:</i> 06/30/2002	09/30/2003

*Borrower/Implementing Agency:* GOVERNMENT/GOM

*Other Partners:*

### STAFF

	<i>Current</i>	<i>At Appraisal</i>
<i>Vice President:</i>	Callisto E. Madavo	Callisto E. Madavo
<i>Country Director:</i>	Darius Mans	Phyllis Pomerantz
<i>Sector Manager:</i>	Richard G. Scobey	Cynthia C. Cook
<i>Team Leader at ICR:</i>	Agnes I. Kiss	Robert A. Clement-Jones
<i>ICR Primary Author:</i>	Michael John Webster	

## 2. Principal Performance Ratings

(HS=Highly Satisfactory, S=Satisfactory, U=Unsatisfactory, HL=Highly Likely, L=Likely, UN=Unlikely, HUN=Highly Unlikely, HU=Highly Unsatisfactory, H=High, SU=Substantial, M=Modest, N=Negligible)

*Outcome:* S  
*Sustainability:* L  
*Institutional Development Impact:* SU  
*Bank Performance:* S  
*Borrower Performance:* S

*Quality at Entry:* QAG (if available) ICR  
U  
*Project at Risk at Any Time:*

### 3. Assessment of Development Objective and Design, and of Quality at Entry

#### 3.1 *Original Objective:*

The objective of the project was twofold: “(i) to create an enabling policy and institutional environment for the rehabilitation and conservation of the recipient's natural and biodiversity endowments; and (ii) to assist the recipient in the implementation of community-based natural resource management programs”. The project coined the term “transfrontier conservation area” (TFCA) as the central concept around which the project was designed. The “transfrontier” aspect (crossing an international boundary) was important because of the following: (i) many major ecosystems, and wildlife migratory patterns, straddle international boundaries, (ii) collaboration between Mozambique and some of its stronger neighbors enables an element of regional capacity building, and (iii) tourism crosses international boundaries. In particular, Mozambique can benefit from the more developed South African tourism industry, and South Africa can benefit from Mozambique’s eco-tourism potential. The term “conservation areas” was important because it denoted multiple use areas covering a range of activities including traditional national parks, community-based management areas, private reserves for tourism and hunting concessions. TFCAs are now widely accepted as important mechanisms for biodiversity conservation and regional integration and have potential economic benefits through eco-tourism and community development. The project was the first phase, a pilot, for a program envisioned over 10-15 years.

The project objective was clear and important for both the Bank and the Government of Mozambique (GOM). The Bank’s Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) assessed that conservation of the environment and natural resource base was critical to economic growth and long-term sustainable development, and as such, this project was part of a core objective of the Bank’s assistance. The project was important for GOM, as articulated in the National Environment Action Plan; however, while the project objective was reflected in the national strategy document, the importance of the project was not fully appreciated by many officials within GOM. The reason for this lack of buy-in is assumed to be because the link to poverty reduction and economic growth was not obvious to many officials and these objectives were most pressing for a country regarded as the poorest in the world, and emerging from 16 years of civil war.

The project was complex and "high risk / high reward". The risks were well identified in the project document and worth taking in order to exploit the window of opportunity in the country's history for protecting areas of global biodiversity significance. If the project had not been as ambitious as it was (in both scope, i.e., the number of activities; and physical area, i.e., over 22,000km<sup>2</sup> of conservation areas), it is likely that these areas would be lost to conservation and the opportunity to protect them may not re-occur (as much of the land with high tourist potential is now privately owned). The project was complex, as determined by the broad range of reforms and activities planned at the national, provincial, local and community level; the number of institutions required to implement, and liaise with, the project; and the very limited capacity of government, and NGOs, that existed in the country at the time.

#### 3.2 *Revised Objective:*

The objective was not revised.

#### 3.3 *Original Components:*

The project consisted of four components:

Component 1. **Institutional and policy development** (\$3.4 million, 49% of project costs):

- Capacity building of national, provincial and local government. Build the capacity (through training of staff, provision of technical advisory services and logistical support, including vehicles, equipment, office supplies and refurbishing and study tours and twinning arrangements) of national government (within the Ministry of Agriculture and later in the newly created Ministry of Tourism) to fulfill its mandate of policy formulation, planning and technical guidance, and provide support to provincial and local government (through training, technical assistance and logistical support) in the three TFCAs;
- GIS/EIS system. Support for the establishment and maintenance of a GIS/EIS system for resource inventory and forestry and wildlife management at national and provincial level;
- Development and field-testing natural resource policies. Develop a national policy framework defining the roles of the public and private sectors, NGOs and communities in sustainable development, including policy formulation, legislative review and national policy workshops;
- Action plan to enhance private sector role in sustainable NRM. Support the implementation of the national government's action plan through: policy and legislative reform, tendering and project approval mechanisms, review of tax regime, fees, licenses and revenue retention, regulation monitoring, law enforcement and facilitation of community relations; and
- International Collaboration. Strengthen the capacity of the Government to enhance international collaboration through provision of logistical support, workshops, training and staff and community exchange programs.

Component 2. **Habitat and wildlife management** (\$1.7 million, 24%):

- Identification, zoning and demarcation of existing or proposed protected areas, including the areas of Chimanimani, Banhine, Zinave, Maputo Game Reserve, Futi Corridor and Coutada 16;
- Development of long-term management plans for proposed and existing protected areas, including surveys, ecological and social studies, monitoring and appraisals; and
- Rehabilitation of roads and tracks and water supply points, fencing in existing and proposed protected areas, including provision of camp facilities or staff housing facilities.

Component 3. **Community mobilization and pilot programs** (\$1.6 million, 23%):

- Carrying out of a program of community involvement, mobilization and participation in natural resources management including promotion, identification, appraisal, designing and supervision of small-scale pilot activities and provision of sub-grants for the financing thereof.

Component 4. **Monitoring and evaluation** (\$0.3 million, 4%):

- Designing and thereafter carrying out of a monitoring and evaluation program to assess the impact of the Project. The M&E system should monitor: institutional strengthening/policy changes; biological status; socioeconomic and community behavior; and project implementation.

### *Assessment of components*

Overall, the design of the components was closely related to achieving the project objective; however, it did not adequately take into account the capacity of the implementing agency, particularly as this was a complex and ambitious project. Relevant lessons from other projects were incorporated into the design.

- Component 1 was well designed and was entirely necessary to achieve the objective of an enabling policy and institutional environment for conservation. The sub-component on private sector

involvement over-estimated the potential for investment at this time; however, the approach of first focusing on establishing the enabling environment for private investment was the correct approach;

- Component 2 was well designed and will be strengthened in the follow-on project. Many of the physical works needed to implement this component e.g. the rehabilitation of a large number of roads and infrastructure in vast areas, require far greater resources and capacity than could be handled under this project;
- Component 3 had weaknesses in the design. It did not adequately take account of the existing situation in the three TFCAs, for example, the very poor infrastructure which makes marketing of any goods very difficult and the lack of experience of GOM and local NGOs in implementing community-based natural resource management programs; and
- Component 4 was adequately designed. However, as discussed in 4.2, this component was not seen as a priority and was poorly implemented.

Lessons from other countries, particularly in CBNRM, were taken into account, for example, many lessons from the CAMPFIRE project in Zimbabwe influenced the design of component 3. However, the challenge of post-conflict reconstruction in Mozambique (which was under-estimated in the design) created quite different challenges for CBNRM which meant that other countries experiences were less relevant.

### *3.4 Revised Components:*

The project components were not formally revised; however, the budget allocations for the four components changed shortly after the grant became effective as the SDC co-financing (grant of \$2.6 million) never materialized. In response, component 1 was revised (much of the work planned in the Lubombo TFCA was dropped) and component 3 was revised to reflect the new budget. The budget revision did not require Executive Director approval and was approved at the Director level. Component 3 was substantially changed after the mid-term review (although no formal revision was done) to focus on activities relating to land demarcation of communities. This is discussed in detail in 4.2.

The project closing date was extended twice. The original closing date (June 30, 2002) was extended for a year to June 30, 2003, and later to September 30, 2003 as progress had been slower than expected.

### *3.5 Quality at Entry:*

*Unsatisfactory.* While the project concept articulates a bold and innovative vision for sustainable conservation, tourism and community development and was a priority for the Bank and GOM; the design contained some significant weaknesses. In particular, the project lacked sufficient ownership from GOM at entry, some components were unrealistic, and the potential problem of communities living within the protected areas was not adequately anticipated.

The project developed and refined the concept of transfrontier conservation i.e. multiple land-use zones which cross international boundaries in promoting sustainable conservation and development. This concept, through the implementation of the project, has provided a platform for numerous follow-on activities by GOM and donors in the area of conservation and tourism. Shortly after the concept was developed, it was enthusiastically adopted by many other donors after a conference in Cape Town in 1996, and is now recognized by NEPAD and SADC as an important mechanism for development. The project also exploited a unique window of opportunity for securing vast areas of significant biodiversity for conservation.

The objective was consistent with the CAS and with the stated policy of GOM; however, there was little



ownership of the project by GOM during project preparation. This may have been because the full potential benefits of the project – in particular, for regional integration and development of the nascent tourism industry – may not have been fully appreciated by the GOM at the time.

The project design benefited from a committed and tenacious team attempting a complex task; however, while the resulting design had an impressive level of detail and conceptual clarity, it also had significant weaknesses. It took a long time to prepare (5 years) – partly due to the fact that the country was emerging from civil war and had very low capacity to absorb the preparation activities, and partly due to the initial low interest from GOM. While the ambitious scope of the project may be justified conceptually (the securing of vast areas for conservation); some aspects of project design were not realistic given the confines of the size of the project and the capacity within GOM to implement it. As assessed in 3.3, component 3 did not adequately take the existing environment into consideration and lead to an unrealistic design.

The design did not sufficiently anticipate all the potential problems of communities living in protected areas. The project did not plan to resettle communities, as part of the project concept was for communities to participate in all conservation and tourism activities as appropriate; however, this view of the options for communities living in protected areas was not shared by all stakeholders. During implementation, the Limpopo National Park was gazetted as a National Park before adequate resolution of the fate of the communities living in the area; and while the project is not directly responsible for this action, policy guidance on the resettlement options could have been explored more thoroughly in the design. Involuntary resettlement was not recognized as a significant issue by the Bank at the time (the Involuntary Resettlement safeguard has corrected this weakness) and hence this issue is more of an institutional issue than specific to this project.

## **4. Achievement of Objective and Outputs**

### *4.1 Outcome/achievement of objective:*

*Satisfactory.* The outcome of the project is deemed to be satisfactory, as the project achieved most of its objective, and this objective is relevant to GOM's current development priorities. Since a logical framework was not developed (this was not a requirement for GEF or other Bank projects at the time), the ICR has developed key performance indicators of outcome and outputs based on the grant agreement, the project document (particularly annex 1 and 8) and the mid-term review (annex 1). The outcome is assessed based on the following three indicators: (i) improved enabling environment for rehabilitation and conservation of biodiversity and NRM; (ii) improved habitat and wildlife management within the three TFCAs; and (iii) involvement of local communities within the TFCAs in CBNRM and small-scale revenue generating activities.

The overall rating is satisfactory as indicator (i) has been achieved beyond expectation, and indicator (ii) has been largely achieved; however, indicator (iii) is rated unsatisfactory. The project was the first to establish and develop the concept of transfrontier conservation which has subsequently been adopted by other donors, SADC and NEPAD. The leverage that this relatively small project has been able to accomplish in attracting subsequent donor interest, and establishing a platform for future conservation and tourism programs is beyond what was anticipated during the design phase. The project has added to a growing national, regional and global interest in the concept of transfrontier conservation as a way of combining joint objectives of conservation, community development, tourism and regional cooperation. In addition, the significant policy and institutional development and the creation of large new conservation areas, substantially outweigh the weaknesses in CBNRM.

Assessment of each of outcome indicator:

(i) Improved institutional and policy environment. *Satisfactory*. The project made significant progress in the development of policies and institutional capacity for biodiversity conservation. The capacity of national government to formulate policy, plan and given technical guidance to the TFCAs and the conservation sector has been greatly enhanced (see component 1.4 in annex 1 for details). A small, flexible unit that is able to coordinate within MITUR and with other Ministries, in particular, MADER and MICOA, now exists, and this gives an institutional basis for future environmental policy development. However, while all the capacity building activities at provincial and local level designed in the project were performed, the resultant capacity at the sub-national level remains weak. Some progress has been made in creating an enabling environment for private sector investment in conservation and tourism; however, no investments were actually realized. The extent and profile of the international collaboration has probably been the most successful outcome of the project. One international treaty and two international agreements have been signed between GOM and neighboring countries. The project has succeeded in formulating and developing the concept of transfrontier conservation, a concept held up by SADC as a significant achievement in regional integration. As a measure of the success of the pilot, other donors (KfW, USAID and Ford Foundation) have invested in the concept, and a platform for further Bank projects in tourism development and conservation has been created. The project has received extensive media coverage, for example, from environmental journals such as National Geographic on the concept of transfrontier conservation.

(ii) Improved habitat and wildlife management in 3 TFCAs. *Satisfactory*. The protected areas have been classified and demarcated but further efforts (infrastructure and equipment for the parks) are to be done to improve the conditions for a better management of these PAs. The establishment of one of the world's largest conservation areas (GLTFP) is perhaps the highest profile achievement of the project. The establishment of the Elephant Coast Development Authority (semi-autonomous development agency for Matutuine District) and the protocol for the Lubombo TFCA are also significant achievements. Poaching in all TFCAs has been reduced and anecdotal evidence is that the level of wildlife has increased in all PA's.

(iii) Communities involved in CBNRM. *Unsatisfactory*. Due to the lack of emphasis and resources for tangible outputs at the community level, negligible benefit has been felt by communities. This was a serious concern for a number of stakeholders that were interviewed. This concern needs to be balanced by the stated project strategy to first concentrate on the policy and institutional environment, before developing infrastructure and income-generating activities which may be the focus of a follow-on project. The physical activities implemented by the project include some CBNRM activities in Chimanimani, Banhine, Zinhave and Limpopo, and land demarcation activities in each TFCA. In addition, some of the physical activities planned under the project are currently being implemented by other donors: CBNRM in Chimanimani by Ford Foundation, development of LNP by KfW and the management plans and other activities in GLTFCA by USAID. No data exists on the impact of CBNRM, for example, on increased incomes or improved livelihood.

#### 4.2 *Outputs by components:*

Annex 1 gives a detailed breakdown of the achievements of outputs by components. Table 1 rates each component and sub-component as listed in the grant agreement.

**Table 1. Rating of components and sub-components**

Component/Output		
1. Institutional and policy development		<b>S</b>
	Strengthening the institutional capacities of DNFFB and SPFFB through training of their staff, provision of technical advisory services and logistical support, including vehicles, equipment, office supplies, office refurbishing, and organization of study tours and twinning arrangements.	S
	Provision of support for the establishment and maintenance of a GIS/EIS system.	U
	Carrying out of a program for development and field testing of natural resource policies.	S
	Private Sector: Preparation and thereafter implementation of an action plan to enhance private sector role and an action plan to enhance community-based natural resource management.	S
	International Collaboration. Strengthening of the capacity of the Recipient to enhance international collaboration between the Recipient and the neighboring countries, through the provision of logistical support and organization of workshops, training, and staff and community exchange programs including travel related thereto.	HS
2. Habitat and wildlife management		<b>S</b>
	Identification, zoning and demarcation of existing or proposed protected areas, including the areas of Chimanimani, Banhine, Zinave, Maputo Game Reserve, Futi Corridor and Coutada 16.	S
	Development of long-term management plans for proposed and existing protected areas, including surveys, ecological and social studies, monitoring and appraisals.	S
	Rehabilitation of roads and tracks and water supply points, fencing in existing and proposed protected areas, including provision of camp facilities or staff housing facilities.	S
3. Community mobilization and pilot programs		<b>U</b>
	Carrying out of a program of community involvement, mobilization and participation in natural resources management including promotion, identification, appraisal, designing and supervision of small-scale pilot activities and provision of sub-grants for the financing thereof.	U
4. Monitoring and evaluation		<b>HU</b>
	Designing and thereafter carrying out of a monitoring and evaluation program to assess the impact of the Project.	HU

When viewing table 1 it is important to appreciate the relative importance of the different components and sub-components. Weighting of components is reflected in the relative proportion of the total budget (see 3.3), and the importance of the component and sub-component to achieving the project objective.

**Component 1. Institutional and policy development. Satisfactory**

- National level. All institutional development activities were carried out as planned, originally by MADER, and later by MITUR. Capacity at the national level to formulate policy, plan and give technical guidance to TFCAs has been built in the form of a small TFCA unit. The unit reports directly the Minister of Tourism and has the ability to coordinate between directorates within MITUR and with other Ministries, in particular, MADER and MICOA. The effectiveness and efficiency of project implementation has increased markedly since the project moved into its current institutional arrangement in MITUR;
- Provincial and local level. Capacity building, training, technical assistance and logistical support activities were mostly completed as planned. However, while some capacity has been built during project implementation at the national level, very little capacity has been built at the provincial, district and community level for biodiversity conservation. Sub-national capacity building will be a focus of the follow-on project;
- A GIS unit was created within DNFFB and training was provided; however full staffing of the unit was

not carried out as originally planned. In addition, when the project was transferred from MADER to MITUR, the GIS capacity remained with MADER, although it is available for use by the TFCA unit. The mid-term review assessed that development of a GIS unit with the capacity as originally designed would be inadvisable, as the GIS needs of the project did not justify such expenditure;

- Significant policy development was achieved in a variety of sector, including: wildlife, forestry, land and NRM laws were revised, hunting fees in hunting concessions were revised, tendering processes and project approval mechanisms were reviewed. However the project was unable to provide sufficient clarity on policy relating the community resettlement issues;
- Private sector involvement. A number of surveys, tender guidelines, guidelines for private sector engagement and action plans were developed through the project to improve the investment climate. While no private investment was forthcoming, substantial investment is anticipated in the follow-on project;
- International collaboration. The extent and profile of the international collaboration has probably been the most successful outcome of the project. One International Treaty and two Agreements were signed by the Heads of State of Mozambique, South Africa, Swaziland and Zimbabwe as a result of the project, committing each country to the TFCA concept. These treaties and agreements were regarded by SADC as a significant achievement in regional integration;
- Donor investment: As a direct result of the project, other donors invested in the TFCAs, in particular, KfW, USAID and Ford Foundation. Other donor interest has been raised as a result of the project; and
- A platform for further Bank projects in tourism development and conservation has been created, with the following projects already under preparation: TFCATDP (TFCA and Tourism Development Project) follow-on project including the government program, PROTUSC (Program for Sustainable Tourism and Conservation) and SEATIP (South East African Tourism Investment Program) (IFC).

## Component 2. **Habitat and wildlife management.** *Satisfactory*

Annex 1 provides detail on all the specific conservation activities completed by the project, and annex 8 (the borrower's report) gives a more detailed account of the achievements and constraints experienced in each TFCA. The main achievements in this component include the development of resource management plans, improvement of law enforcement in the TFCAs, wildlife surveys and the rehabilitation and establishment of the new TFCAs, including some supporting infrastructure.

### Identification, zoning and demarcation of land for Protected Areas:

#### Chimanimani TFCA

- Demarcation of core protected area;

#### Great Limpopo TFCA

- Formal gazetting of LNP (2001) and creation of GLTFP;
- Boundary demarcation of Banhine and Zinave NP;

#### Lubombo TFCA

- Maputo Elephant Reserve demarcated;
- Creation of Elephant Coast Development Authority;
- Demarcation of Futi Corridor; and
- Proposal for extension of Maputo Elephant Reserve into Futi corridor completed.

### Management plans and ecological and social studies:

#### Chimanimani TFCA

- Development of a Resource Management Plan and Integrated Action Plan;

#### Great Limpopo TFCA

- Management plans for core protected areas – these have been funded by other donors: USAID

is developing detailed management plans for Banhine and Zinave NP, and KfW is financing management plan for LNP;

- Development of land-use plan for communal area between PA's ("interstitial area");

Lubombo TFCA

- Development and adoption of Maputo Special Reserve Management Plan; and
- Development of proposal for eco-tourism concessions.

#### Rehabilitation of parks:

Chimanimani TFCA

- Roads to key tourist attractions opened;
- Community guards trained and camps established, radios installed;
- Additional funding from Ford Foundation to manage the TFCA and provide some infrastructure;

Great Limpopo TFCA

- Increased field presence and some minor infrastructure in LNP, Banhine and Zinhave, including, surveys, water supplies, roads radios, training of guards and provision of transport; and

Lubombo TFCA

- Increased local park management and law enforcement.

#### Component 3. **Community mobilization and pilot programs.** *Unsatisfactory.*

The project struggled to implement this component as planned. The environment in which CBNRM activities were to be implemented were much more difficult than anticipated in the design. The areas in the Limpopo and Lubombo TFCAs are home to very remote communities, and have very little infrastructure, essential for both the community mobilization work, and as access to a market for income generating products. In addition, most of the NGOs implementing CBNRM were found not to be effective as a result of their limited experience and lack of orientation towards grass-roots community development work. Local authorities were also not sufficiently involved in implementation. The result is that very little CBNRM was implemented in Lubombo and Limpopo; however, more successful CBNRM was implemented in Chimanamani TFCA. However, some CBNRM activities were carried out – Annex 1 provides details on these activities.

The mid-term review recommended that the component be re-designed to focus more on land demarcation. The new land law afforded the opportunity to work directly with communities to demarcate community ownership of land. Land demarcation has the potential to secure community property rights over land, and thus ensure that the community benefits from any future economic benefits accruing from the land. Over 70,000 ha of community land were demarcated by the project. Although this was not part of the original design, land demarcation became an important achievement of the project.

#### Component 4. **Monitoring and Evaluation.** *Highly unsatisfactory.*

Despite repeated requests from the Bank to design and implement an M&E system (this point was stressed in many aide memoires and the mid-term review), a system was never put in place. A design was done in early 2002, however the design was believed to be impractical to implement and it was believed to be too late in the project to implement the system. As the project was supposed to be a pilot project, testing new methodologies for use in later projects, the lack of a robust M&E system is a serious omission, as lessons cannot be fully captured with sufficient rigor.

#### *4.3 Net Present Value/Economic rate of return:*

No economic analysis of the project was not done at appraisal, as a formal cost-benefit analysis would have been problematic, as many of the benefits are difficult to value. Similarly, no ex-post analysis has been conducted.

#### *4.4 Financial rate of return:*

No FRR was calculated during appraisal, or the ICR, as the project activities did not lend themselves to this type of analysis.

#### *4.5 Institutional development impact:*

*Substantial.* The project has had a substantial impact on improving the institutional capacity of GOM to formulate policy and coordinate conservation and tourism functions of government. A nodal institution now exists, the TFCA unit, within MITUR, to liaise with counterparts in neighboring countries on matters of tourism and conservation; to implement donor projects in the sector (e.g. the follow-on project) and to coordinate, through park management units, activities in the TFCA unit and effectively manage conservation activities in their jurisdiction. The unit is flexible and autonomous enough to be able work across Directorates within the Ministry, and to work with other Ministries, in particular, MADER and MICOA – this is an essential capability in implanting and integrated approach to conservation. The international treaties and agreements reached in the three TFCAs and the regional management committees responsible for managing these areas are a further substantive impact of the project. The formulation of the ECDA in Lubombo TFCA is an important institution to promote public-private partnerships for tourism and conservation in the area.

The project was designed to be implemented directly by MADER, through DNFFB. Many of the institutional development activities i.e. capacity building, training, logistical support, technical assistance etc. were done within DNFFB and SBFFB in the three provinces in which the TFCAs are located. In 2000, the project was shifted to the newly created Ministry of Tourism (MITUR) where it was implemented by the National Directorate of Conservation Areas (DNAC). In 2001 a separate TFCA unit was created which reported directly to the Minister of Tourism. The mid-term review recommended that the TFCA unit report directly to the Minister of Tourism in order to increase the profile of the project and to give the unit more autonomy. A clear result of the move was that the project was able to deliver much more effectively and efficiently once it had its own unit and could report directly the Minister.

While many institutional development and capacity building activities did take place at the provincial, district and local level, the institutional development impact of these activities is modest; however, this will be a greater focus during the follow-on project. Sub-national capacity building is clearly also affected by the broader decentralization agenda of GOM.

## **5. Major Factors Affecting Implementation and Outcome**

### *5.1 Factors outside the control of government or implementing agency:*

- Canceling of SDC co-financing. *Substantial.* \$2.6 million grant co-financing from SDC was cancelled between the time of project approval and grant effectiveness. This had a substantial impact on the scope of component 1 (activities in the Lubombo TFCA were curtailed) and Component 3 (a range of activities were reduced) though effective reprioritization of expenditures ensured that component 1 achieved its key activities and impacts;

- Communities living in Protected Areas. *Substantial*. A major challenge the project faced was the issue of communities living in PAs. There are approximately 27,000 people living in the LNP (about 6,500 in the core zone in which wildlife will be abundant) and a few thousand people in the Futi Corridor. These communities need careful consideration in the development of the TFCA, and particularly in areas designated for wildlife habitation. Despite the efforts of the Bank staff and project team to resolve the fate of the communities living in Coutada 16, and the assurances given by GOM that the issue would be adequately resolved prior to any action, in 2001, the LNP was gazetted as a national park and some animals were allowed to enter the park area. This created a lot of media attention and controversy around the project. While the Bank and the project were not to blame for the controversy, the policy options for communities living in PAs could have been explored further during design (as highlighted in 3.5). The project developed a Management Plan for the Maputo Special Reserve (within the Lubombo TFCA, with demarcation for local communities within the Futi Corridor). In addition, communities currently relying on subsistence hunting for their livelihood may be reluctant to resettle. While the project failed to achieve adequate clarity at the policy level on this issue, the solution to the “people in parks” problem is not obvious, particular for communities that have lived for generations off the wildlife in the area;
- Floods. *Partial*. The 2000 floods significantly affected implementation, particularly in Banhine, Zinave and Limpopo. Physical work that had been completed in these areas needed to be redone, plus the project experienced significant delays due to the floods; and
- Emergence from civil war. *Partial*. The project experienced multiple difficulties in working in a country emerging from decades of civil war in which very little administrative and other capacity existed, and conservation was low on the list of priorities.

#### *5.2 Factors generally subject to government control:*

Lack of capacity in all levels of government to give adequate attention to the project caused delays, particularly in the early years of operation. In addition, the change in responsible government ministries from MADER to MITUR, firstly under the DNAC and later in an autonomous TFCA unit reporting directly to Minister significantly impacted implementation. The project did not begin to deliver substantially until this final move into its current form. The transition from MADER to DNAC and to an autonomous TFCA unit had resulted in some initial overlap of responsibility; however, institutional responsibilities have now been adequately clarified. The project has significantly benefited from a high level of interest and involvement from the Minister of Tourism and senior officials within MITUR. At provincial level, the Director SPFFB was the nodal officer responsible for the project along with responsibility for all other wildlife and forestry issues in the province. This put a serious strain on the time available for the project. In Chimanimani, the Director SPFFB was allowed to work entirely on the TFCA project which freed up sufficient time to deliver the CMNRM activities.

While governance problems have been flagged in the CAS as an important endemic issue in the country, no significant governance issues appeared to emerge during implementation. However, transparency in awarding concessions is still an issue, particularly with regard to the renewal of the Coutada 16 hunting concession in 1996 (for 15 years) and the consequent negotiations with the concessionaire; and the procedures for awarding contracts in Lubombo, in particular in the Milibangalala concession. Full transparency in concessioning and the awarding of contracts will continue to be an important issue in the follow on project.

#### *5.3 Factors generally subject to implementing agency control:*

Over the life of the project, an effective implementing agency has been developed. The agency, the TFCA

unit within MITUR, is now able to manage the three TFCA units effectively and make a substantial contribution to the national policy formulation. It is fully staffed and well placed to implement the follow-on project. However, this unit has only come into being during the last year and a half of the project, once the project was moved from MADER to MITUR and was given autonomy to report directly to the Minister of Tourism. Before this time, a number of operational weaknesses were experienced, including: poor financial management due to a two year delay in auditing, out of date financial management software and the lack of a procurement officer in the unit – each of these three issues were resolved once the unit was notified.

#### *5.4 Costs and financing:*

Costs. The project was financed by a GEF grant, GOM counterpart funding, and was intended to be co-financed by an SDC grant. Two factors resulted in significant costs changes: (i) At grant signing, the SDC were expected to co-finance the project through a grant of \$2.6 million; however, SDC funds were never forthcoming, and therefore the budget was significantly reallocated; (ii) the devaluation of the SDR resulted in a reduction in the project budget of about \$300,000. This cost reduction came off each of the project components.

Fund flow problems caused some delays to activities in the field; however, did not significantly affect the overall project implementation. While some delays in counterpart funding from GOM were experienced, all counterpart funding was received in the end. The total grant was almost entirely used.

## **6. Sustainability**

#### *6.1 Rationale for sustainability rating:*

*Likely.* The project was the first phase of a longer-term program likely to span 10-15 years. The benefits achieved under this project, in biodiversity conservation, institutional capacity, regional integration and the improved environment for investment in eco-tourism will be further strengthened in the follow-on project and are likely to be sustainable. Long-term environmental management plans have been formulated for the three TFCAs and can be in other future conservation areas. The TFCAs within the project have been gazetted as protected areas and, as such, the environmental sustainability will be protected by the state. In order to ensure long-term financial sustainability of the TFCAs, funding will need to be secured outside of government as government transfers will not be sufficient to maintain the conservation areas. Donor funding over the medium term looks very promising, in particular, the Bank follow-on project, IFC SEATIP project under preparation, KfW, USAID and the possibility of other bilateral funding. However, in the long-term, private sector investments is needed to ensure tourism revenues are available for conservation. This success of the symbiotic relationship between conservation and tourism, actively promoted by the follow-on project, is likely to determine the future sustainability of the TFCAs. The project enjoys a high profile within the MITUR, and thus it is expected that the capacity built in the project will be used in the follow-on project and for other activities in conservation and tourism. The government is committed to the 3 TFCAs created by the project and there is every indication that these institutions will be supported by GOM in future. However, the few benefits from CBNRM activities undertaken in component 3 are not likely to be sustainable without additional support. Most of the initiatives have not clearly established markets for their goods, and do not have the necessary infrastructure to take there goods to any potential markets.

#### *6.2 Transition arrangement to regular operations:*

As the first phase of a longer program, the primary transition the project will make is into implementing the



follow-on project. The follow-on project (TFCATDP) has as its draft objective: “to improve the management of Mozambique’s natural resources assets in a manner conducive to private sector tourism and development to obtain sustainable livelihood and economic development benefits”. It extends the concepts developed in the project being assessed and includes a larger component of tourism development and infrastructure provision. The project is planned to be implemented in the current three TFCAs and to develop two new TFCAs: Niassa TFCA (60,000 km<sup>2</sup> between Mozambique and Malawi) and Zimoza TFCA (31,000 km<sup>2</sup> between Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe). The performance measure by which the project, and the overall program are measure, must be captured in an M&E system that is a priority in the early stages of TFCATDP.

At the national level, the TFCA unit is fully engaged in the preparation of the follow-on Bank project which is a direct extension of the project. At the provincial and district level, no separate TFCA unit exists, therefore MITUR will continue to coordinate the TFCAs along with their other departmental work. Each TFCA has different institutional arrangements for future operations: GLTNP (within the Great Limpopo TFCA) is managed by a three country committee (currently chaired by Mozambique) which currently receives support from KfW. The future revenue sharing arrangements in the park are currently under discussion. Institutional arrangements in the Lubombo TFCA are still in a state of flux, and will not be resolved until the international committee of representatives from Mozambique, Swaziland and South Africa have taken the process further. The establishment of the Elephant Coast Development Agency – which will focus on integrated planning in Matutuine District (of Maputo Province) – is expected to have a substantial impact on the functioning of the Lubombo TFCA. Chimanimani TFCA is less affected by the broader political-institutional context as it is a much smaller and relatively simpler TFCA. It is likely that it will continue to be managed by the provincial director of MITUR and the district officials.

## **7. Bank and Borrower Performance**

### **Bank**

#### ***7.1 Lending:***

*Unsatisfactory.* The Bank’s performance in identification, preparation assistance and appraisal benefited from a high level of commitment from Bank staff and consultants working under difficult conditions. The resulting project was important and innovative; however had significant weaknesses. The project took a long time to prepare, did not receive sufficient commitment from GOM, and had some design weaknesses. The project took 5 years to prepare, and did not sustain the interest of GOM over all this time. As assessed in 3.5, the project design took the Bank’s priorities (as stated in the CAS) into account, and worked closely with the government to ensure the project was aligned to GOM priorities; however, overall, GOM had not bought-in to the concept to a satisfactory level. However, as this was a pilot project which was explicitly piloted innovative new approaches, the lack of government buy-in during preparation is not seen as a hindrance to the project achieving positive outcomes. The tenacity of the design team in pursuing the project preparation, despite difficult conditions, needs special mention.

Other specific design weaknesses are:

- The design should have better anticipated the resettlement issues, in particular, through an involuntary resettlement safeguard or some more robust policy on the options for communities living in protected areas. During preparation, involuntary settlement was not recognized by the Bank (or GEF) as the significant issue it is today; therefore, this omission by the project designers is more of a weakness of the Bank than any individuals;
- Although the project was based in Mozambique, as a transfrontier project more time was needed to build consensus with neighboring states to ensure the overall concept was shared; however, it is

recognized that this may have extended the preparation time even further - which would not have been desirable;

- The design did not adequately take into account the existing situation in the areas ear marked for the TFCAs and the capacity of GOM and NGOs to implement these kinds of community-based programs; and
- The expected outcomes from the multiple activities needed to be more rigorously assessed through a logical framework analysis, or similar strategy/design tool, to ensure the project was more focused and the project objective, global objective and indicators were clear and understood by all stakeholders.

### *7.2 Supervision:*

*Satisfactory.* Supervision of the project was consistent and satisfactory, despite a high turn-over of TTL's in Washington. This is due to two factors: most TTL's shared a common understanding of the project and worked hard at ensuring continuity of supervision; and more importantly, the project benefited from high quality, consistent field presence of the same technical expert throughout supervision. Strong management from the field meant that the relationships with GOM were well managed and the implementing agency could draw on accessible Bank expertise. Other criteria of Bank supervision are assessed below:

- Reporting of project implementation progress through Aide Memoires and supervision missions was satisfactory; however the PSR, SAP financial updates and IRIS were not updated on time;
- Implementation problems were detected early and addressed proactively, for example, the shift in component 3 from CBNRM to land demarcation;
- Realistic performance ratings were given in the PSR for development objective; however, some of the earlier ratings for the implementation progress may have been lenient;
- The supervision staff maintained a clear focus on the possible development impact and the wider developmental consequence of the project;
- Very high quality advice was consistently given to the GOM and the implementing agency to improve performance;
- Bank supervision was flexible to modifications in approach, for example, in constantly improving the institutional arrangements;
- Working relationships across the Bank, borrower, implementing agency and other partners were extremely good;
- Sufficient and satisfactory supervision missions were fielded; however, as can be seen in Annex 4, not all of these were correctly entered into the electronic system, and are therefore not adequately captured.

### *7.3 Overall Bank performance:*

*Satisfactory.* On balance, Bank performance is rated as satisfactory, in recognition of the strong contribution during supervision that turned around what could have been a problem project.

### **Borrower**

#### *7.4 Preparation:*

*Satisfactory.* GOM contributed to all preparation activities adequately. Personnel from DNFFB were active members of all Bank preparation missions and contributed as appropriate. The interest of the government improved substantially during project preparation as the project concept shifted from the original conservation-focused concept, to the broader TFCA concept including conservation, community development and regional integration through multiple-use zones.

### 7.5 Government implementation performance:

*Satisfactory.* Government interest in the project was mixed over the life of the project. The initial implementation of the project by MADER (DNFFB) was slow in progressing. The transfer of the project from MADER to MITUR caused substantial delays in the project due to unresolved institutional disputes. Under the current arrangement, the project benefits from a high degree of positive involvement by senior government officials and appears to be a priority for GOM. The project experienced a slow release of counterpart funding for contract mobilization; however, all counterpart funding was released.

### 7.6 Implementing Agency:

*Satisfactory.* The TFCA unit as it exists in its current form has a highly motivated, capable and professional staff that have demonstrated a high level of commitment to the project. However, the project did suffer some problems with performance during implementation, in particular, delays due to insufficient familiarity with the Bank's procurement guidelines, and insufficient implementation capacity, delaying procurement and disbursement schedules. However, by the end of the project, all capacity issues had been resolved. A number of financial management deficiencies were experienced during the project: audit delays, out of date software, and the lack of financial management personnel in the TFCA unit; however, these were all adequately resolved.

### 7.7 Overall Borrower performance:

*Satisfactory.*

## 8. Lessons Learned

1. The project created a platform for tourism development and regional integration by using an innovative approach to biodiversity conservation. ***The TFCA concept, as developed by the project, has broad application in Mozambique, and other developing countries with rich biodiversity endowments.***
2. ***Issues of major importance, like land, need an integrated approach which involve the CAS and a range of lending and AAA activities.*** In some ways, the potential of this project – for achieving regional integration and creating a platform for tourism development – was under exploited by the Bank. This was partially because the project was small and may have been assumed to focus solely on conservation.
3. ***Demarcating land for communities can be an effective way of establishing community rights over local natural resources in order to benefit from eco-tourism.*** If communities are clear about the land to which they are entitled, they are in a much stronger bargaining position with private investors to ensure they get their share of benefits from eco-tourism. The project piloted demarcation activities within the TFCAs (over 70,000 ha) and these need to be continued and consolidated in the follow-on project. Land demarcations are the first step in ensuring that communities are not over-whelmed by private sector operators and marginalized in the development process. In addition, in the areas in which land demarcation was tried (Chimanimani and Futi Corridor), CBNRM activities appear to have much greater potential.
4. ***Conservation and community development projects need to demonstrate clear linkages to economic objectives such as growth, income generation or poverty reduction in order to retain focus and ensure sufficient benefits flow to beneficiaries.*** In this project, the importance of tourism was not sufficiently recognized until the TFCA unit was (somewhat fortuitously) established in MITUR. Tourism as a means to ensure the sustainable use of biodiversity needed to be better understood and utilized in the

project. Better understanding and clarification of the economic potential of tourism in TFCAs would have encouraged a greater interest in the project from government and other donors earlier on. Innovative thinking to create tourism flows through TFCAs is now required to ensure future sustainability. However, experience in many other parts of the world show the negative environmental and social impacts that can occur if tourism investments are not carefully planned and regulated.

5. ***Institutional development is a time consuming process that requires commitment from all stakeholders, and extensive capacity building.*** The project created the institutional capacity within MITUR to continue the work of the project into any follow-on projects; however, it took four years of implementation (and five years of preparation) for the institutional arrangements to reach its current form. Only once this capacity was created did the project function effectively. The TFCA unit and the Elephant Coast Development Agency are both products of protracted institutional development efforts which required a long-term commitment from both GOM and the Bank.

6. ***Sensitive issues such as communities living in future National Parks need to be dealt with up-front with all stakeholders and resolved before approval.*** The most controversial aspect of the project is the “people in parks” issue discussed in the text. During implementation, once the issue fully emerged, the project went some way in advising GOM on approaches to dealing with communities living in PAs, and further work in this area is underway; however, the issue should have been anticipated better during project preparation. Communities, and local and provincial governments, need to be involved in the project right from the beginning, particularly in projects that may involve resettlement.

7. ***A trade-off may exist between the expedience and efficiency of delivering a project and the inclusion and strengthening of provincial and district governments needed to improve sustainability.*** The project has developed the capacity of the three TFCA park management units more or less in parallel to provincial and local governments. While this is probably the most expedient institutional approach in the short to medium-term, for long-term sustainability, provincial and district governments need to be more explicitly involved in managing the TFCAs. However, much greater resources are needed to strengthen the capacity of provincial and local administrations as these are time consuming and costly activities.

8. ***Creating an enabling environment for the private sector and encouraging “high quality investors” is a difficult and complex challenge. In similar projects, an advisor dealing with private sector issues should be appointed early on in the project.*** Future projects need to engage potential investors during project preparation in order to anticipate a realistic role for the private sector. The demand side of tourism promotion, for both wildlife and community-based tourism, needs to be fully researched. The extent to which lack of infrastructure presents major constraints for private sector and community development and project management was underestimated and the follow up phase will need to link many of its outputs to infrastructure development.

9. ***In order for a pilot project to produce robust results that test new methodologies, an M&E system must be in place at project effectiveness.*** Future projects should consider not releasing funds until the baseline data for an M&E system has been established.

10. ***Transparency in concessioning still remains an important and elusive goal.*** A concerted effort is required by GOM, with support from the donors, to ensure that communities are not marginalized by land allocations and that the true real estate values of land are attained through auctions or tenders.

## 9. Partner Comments

### *(a) Borrower/implementing agency:*

The TFCA coordinator has submitted a completion report which is presented in Annex 8. The overall assessment of the project is consistent with the ICR. It states that the project was satisfactory in meeting its development objective, and cites the following as the significant weaknesses: (i) inadequate government capacity; (ii) transfer of the project from MADER to MITUR was disruptive; (iii) community mobilization component was not satisfactory; and (iv) too few real benefits were felt by communities from project. The report details the project's outputs within the four components.

### *(b) Cofinanciers:*

The project had no co-financiers, however, the project did benefit from efforts made by other donors (as discussed in previous sections). In particular, KfW, USAID and Ford Foundation all provided complementary funding of activities originally envisaged as part of this project and expansions of the original project concept.

### *(c) Other partners (NGOs/private sector):*

The views of many stakeholders were solicited during the ICR mission. All relevant views are reflected in the Aide Memoire. Relevant non-government agencies interviewed include: bilateral donors (USAID, KfW, SDC), NGOs (IUCN, WWF, PPF, Helvetas, African Wildlife Foundation) and the private sector (CTA, Impacto, DAI). Most partners that were very positive about the impact of the project, in particular, of the platform the project has created for future investments. Some concerns expressed by some partners include: (i) poor communication between implementing agency and NGOs on the potential role for NGOs and the responsibility for funding; (ii) questions were raised about whether the TFCA concept has spread wider than a handful of people in the capital; and (iii) a concern about the viability of CBNRM in some of the TFCAs, and the real potential for community-based tourism in the country; an issue which is being explored further in the follow-on project.

## 10. Additional Information

### *A. The Bank's ICR Team consisted of the following members:*

Michael Webster (YP, AFTS1, and TTL for ICR)  
Cedric Boisrobert (Environmental specialist, AFTS1)  
Rod de Vletter (Independent consultant, World Bank and IFC)

### *B. List of Task Team Leaders of the project:*

Jose Olivera  
Magda Lara-Resende  
Jean-Paul Chausse  
Robert A. Clement-Jones  
Rod de Vletter  
Agnes I. Kiss

### *C. GEF additional requirements*

See annex 9

## Annex 1. Key Performance Indicators/Log Frame Matrix

### Outcome/Impact Indicators

(Outcome indicators are as developed in the MTR and listed in the subsequent PSRs)

Indicator	Projected in Project Document	Actual Estimate
<p>(i) <u>Improved institutional and policy environment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthened capacity within National Government to fulfill its mandate of policy formulation, planning and technical guidance.</li> </ul>	<p>The government is able to fulfill its mandate to formulate policies related to biodiversity conservation</p>	<p>The concerned Ministries (MADER and MITUR) are able to adequately formulate biodiversity conservation policies</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhanced technical and planning capacity at provincial and local level.</li> </ul>	<p>Capacity of the government to implement an ecosystem management approach in TFCAs is developed</p>	<p>Capacity building at national and provincial levels has been carried out but efforts to strengthen and involve provincial and district institutions will need to be further in order to adequately fulfill conservation function</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhanced private sector involvement in sustainable forestry and wildlife management</li> </ul>	<p>Private sector investments will take place in TFCAs in collaboration with local communities in natural resource based activities</p>	<p>Few activities have taken place at this point but the necessary conditions to attract the private sector have significantly improved. Recognizing that investment environment has improved, numerous tourism (and other sectors) related investments are expected in any follow-on project</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthened regional political support for transfrontier biodiversity conservation</li> </ul>	<p>Regional collaboration in transfrontier conservation is established and is functioning</p>	<p>International agreements have been signed by government officials of neighboring countries and transfrontier conservation is well supported in the region.</p>
<p>(ii) <u>Improved habitat and wildlife management</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved protection and management for the utilization of core conservation areas</li> </ul>	<p>In the selected TFCAs, Mozambique's natural assets are protected and managed in a sustainable manner and experience a reversal of unsustainable trends in poaching, uncontrolled burning and other unsustainable use of biodiversity resources in core conservation areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The protected areas have been classified and demarcated and limited infrastructures and equipment have been provided to improve the management of the TFCAs.</li> <li>Wildlife has increased throughout the project life in TFCAs (anecdotal evidence from field staff)</li> </ul>
<p>(iii) <u>Community involved in CBNRM</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased participation of rural communities in the management of forests and wildlife to enhance benefits</li> </ul>	<p>Local communities within TFCAs are involved in small-scale revenue generating activities and customary rights such as land</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relatively few revenue generating activities have taken place yet within the TFCAs.</li> <li>Land demarcation has been</li> </ul>

through recognition of customary rights	demarcation.	carried out for communities in the buffer zones of the National Parks
---	--------------	---

## Output Indicators

(Output indicators have been derived from the Project Document and the MTR)

	Outputs	Projected in Project Document	Actual Estimate
<b>COMPONENT 1: INSTITUTIONAL AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT</b>			
<b>1.1 DNFFB strengthening (National level capacity building)</b>			
	Staffing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Project coordinator will be appointed</li> <li>● Secretary/administrator will be appointed</li> <li>● Technical advisor appointed for project coordinator</li> <li>● Short term park management advisor</li> <li>● Short term community program adviser</li> <li>● Short term commercial/business adviser</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Project coordinator and project administrator appointed</li> <li>● 1 project accountant was appointed</li> <li>● 1 procurement officer was appointed in 2003</li> <li>● A technical advisor was appointed to provide TA and training to JMCs and undertake CBNRM and Community-Based biodiversity conservation</li> <li>● Technical adviser for Lubombo TFCA appointed</li> <li>● A financial controller was appointed</li> <li>● Short term consultancies have been carried out</li> <li>● A national steering committee was created but was not functional because of lack of time, financing and because people were already attending the tourism facilitation committee, which was then used for this purpose instead</li> <li>● Technical committee established</li> <li>● International working groups at the Ministerial level for international agreements (Limpopo and Lubombo)</li> </ul>
	Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Short courses (17) (FM, procurement and disbursement, project planning, park management, PSD, strategic planning, policy formulation, M&amp;E)</li> <li>● BSc courses (1), MSc courses (1)</li> <li>● Medium-level courses (6)</li> <li>● Workshops</li> <li>● Seminars</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Courses have been given</li> <li>● 1 BSc., 1 MSc. and 4 certificate have been financed and completed.</li> <li>● Workshops and seminars were carried out</li> </ul>
	Logistical support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Rehabilitation of offices for the project unit</li> <li>● Logistics and travel allowance for staff</li> <li>● Vehicles and office supplies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Logistical support for international collaboration (travel, subsistence, etc.) was given</li> <li>● Logistical and operating costs provided to the TFCA unit</li> <li>● Vehicles and office equipment were procured.</li> </ul>
<b>1.2 Provincial and local capacity building</b>			

	<p><b>Lubombo TFCA Staffing</b></p> <p>Training</p> <p>Logistical support</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Regional coordinator will be appointed</li> <li>● Secretary will be appointed</li> <li>● Administrator will be appointed</li> <li>● Advisor to regional coordinator will be appointed</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● BSc courses</li> <li>● Training for guards and supervisors</li> <li>● Short course in financial administration</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Driver</li> <li>● Subsistence and travel allowance for staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Project staff were appointed</li> <li>● A regional and area coordinators appointed</li> <li>● Two technical advisors were appointed</li> <li>● A JMC was established but not implemented for lack of funding</li> <li>● TFCA commission appointed, task groups and secretariat established but not functional (instead the Elephant Coast Development Agency –ECDA was established to stimulate responsible tourism in the area and community participation)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Training for guards was carried out</li> <li>● Courses were given</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Logistical support was provided</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Great Limpopo TFCA Staffing</b></p> <p>Training</p> <p>Logistical support</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Regional coordinator</li> <li>● Advisor to regional coordinator</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Short courses, medium-level courses</li> <li>● BSc courses</li> <li>● Short course in financial administration</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Subsistence and travel allowance for staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Project staff was appointed</li> <li>● Two technical advisors were appointed subsequently but both resigned due to hardship of the job</li> <li>● 1 BSc. obtained</li> <li>● The various trainings and courses were given</li> <li>● Community support training for personnel and for communities was carried out</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Logistical support was provided</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Chimanimani TFCA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Staffing</li> <li>● Training</li> <li>● Logistical support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Regional coordinator</li> <li>● Technical advisor</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Short courses, Seminars</li> <li>● BSc courses</li> <li>● Medium-level courses</li> <li>● Short course in financial administration</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Subsistence and travel allowance for staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Project staff appointed</li> <li>● JMC established</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Community support training for personnel and for communities was carried out</li> <li>● The various trainings and courses were carried out</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Logistical support was provided</li> </ul>
<b>1.3 GIS/EIS</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● GIS/EIS at the national, provincial,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Establishment of a GIS unit for each of these 3 levels</li> <li>● Training</li> <li>● EIS/GIS database</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● GIS equipment were already existing but lack of capacity constrained the activity</li> <li>● GIS unit created within DNFFB</li> <li>● Training was provided</li> </ul>



	and TFCA levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>administrator</li> <li>EIS/GIS system analyst</li> <li>EIS/GIS programmer</li> <li>Topographer/cartographer/surveyor</li> <li>Computer operator</li> <li>Other studies and support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staffing was not done</li> <li>Since the project management moved from DNFFB to an independent and cross-sectoral MITUR institution, it was not necessary to create another GIS unit.</li> </ul>
<b>1.4 Development and field testing of natural resource policies</b>			
	Policy and legislative reform and development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of laws</li> <li>Tax regime, fees, licenses and revenue retention reviews</li> <li>Tendering and project approval mechanisms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wildlife, forestry, land and NR laws were revised</li> <li>Hunting fees in hunting concessions were revised</li> <li>The tax regime, fees, licenses and revenue retention review is being studied during the preparation of the second phase of the project</li> <li>Tendering was addressed and project approval mechanisms were reviewed</li> </ul>
<b>1.5 Private sector</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Granting of concessions</li> <li>Action plan to enhance PS role</li> <li>Guidelines for PS development</li> <li>National policy framework for public, PS, NGOs, and communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concessioning in TFCAs is done in a fair and transparent manner</li> <li>Action plans, guidelines, and mechanisms are developed to encourage private sector involvement in TFCAs</li> <li>Various meetings and annual reviews are held with the private sector</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The transparent granting of concessions process is yet to be improved within the government. DINAGECA, which is responsible for the process, responds to MADER, and should be independent, instead of being linked to a sectoral institution.</li> <li>A survey of the private sector currently involved in wildlife management was done</li> <li>Revised safari hunting fees in <i>coutadas</i> was carried out</li> <li>Tender guidelines to foster transparency in awarding concessions in TFCAs was developed</li> <li>Guidelines for PS engagement have been drafted</li> <li>The tender and concessions procedures for the MSR have been finalized</li> <li>Eco-tourism development proposal for Lubombo TFCA was prepared</li> </ul>
<b>1.6 International collaboration</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meetings and workshops between GOM and officials from neighboring states</li> <li>Bi-annual newsletter to disseminate info on transfrontier issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meetings and consultations are done between government officials from concerned countries.</li> <li>Workshops and newsletters are completed to disseminate information and create interests in transborder conservation within the international community</li> <li>International management committees are created</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shared cross-border activities have been implemented</li> <li>Quarterly report from TFCA unit released.</li> <li>One international treaty and two agreements were signed by the Heads of State of Mozambique, South Africa, Swaziland and Zimbabwe as a result of the project, committing each country to the TFCA concept.</li> <li>A bilateral agreement by Mozambique and Zimbabwe was signed for the Chimanimani TFCA.</li> <li>Investments from donor community (USAID, KfW) contributed to transborder conservation efforts in Moz.</li> <li>Important PS investments are likely to be established in the near future (number of</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● JMCs</li> <li>● Joint Management plan for GLTFP</li> </ul>		<p>requests of information for tourism investments increased).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Other TFCA projects in the country/region have emerged.</li> <li>● Mozambique's profile has been raised amid the international community and is starting to be recognized as the initiator for the innovative concept of transfrontier conservation.</li> <li>● TFCA concept recognized by SADC and NEPAD as important development activities for the sub-region and continent.</li> <li>● The Lubombo SDI agreement was signed in 1999 by the 3 presidents.</li> <li>● The Lubombo TFCA protocol was signed by Minister responsible for conservation of the 3 countries.</li> </ul>
<b>COMPONENT 2. HABITAT AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT</b>			
<b>2.1 Identification, zoning, and demarcation of land for TFCAs</b>			
	Lubombo TFCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Demarcation of core protected areas in Maputo Elephant Reserve (MER)</li> <li>● Provisional demarcation by DINAGECA of Futi Corridor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● MER was demarcated</li> <li>● Creation of ECDA</li> <li>● Demarcation of Futi corridor done</li> <li>● Proposal for extension of MER through the Futi corridor completed</li> </ul>
	Great Limpopo TFCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Gazetting of Limpopo NP</li> <li>● Delimitation of the buffer (support) zone</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Limpopo NP was gazetted as a NP in 2001 and the GLTFCA was created.</li> <li>● Boundary demarcation being carried out in Banhine and Zinave.</li> </ul>
	Chimanimani TFCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Demarcation of core protected areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Core protected area gazetted</li> </ul>
<b>2.2 Management plan for PAs and ecological and social studies</b>			
	Lubombo TFCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Study on tourism potential</li> <li>● Management plan</li> <li>● Other studies and surveys</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Study on tourism potential is to be prepared under TFCA2 preparation</li> <li>● MSR management plan released</li> <li>● Socioeconomic survey carried out</li> <li>● Futi corridor plan (linking MSR to Tembe and Nduma NPs)</li> <li>● Aerial surveys were carried out</li> <li>● Elephant survey completed</li> </ul>
	Great Limpopo TFCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Aerial and demographic survey for C16 and Banhine NP</li> <li>● Conceptual plan for the management of C16</li> <li>● Demographic study for Banhine NP</li> <li>● Management plan for Banhine NP</li> <li>● Joint management plan for GLTBP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The aerial and demographic studies were carried out</li> <li>● Socioeconomic survey completed</li> <li>● Conceptual plans for C16, Banhine and Zinave were prepared</li> <li>● Management plans done for the 3 areas done</li> <li>● Reconnaissance surveys done</li> <li>● The interstitial land use plan has been developed</li> <li>● JMP for GLTBP was finalized</li> </ul>
	Chimanimani	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Aerial survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Aerial survey carried out</li> </ul>

	TFCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Demographic and ecological studies study</li> <li>● Resource management plan and action plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Demographic and ecological studies study done</li> <li>● Inventory report on fish species done</li> <li>● Resource management and integrated action plan was developed</li> </ul>
<b>2.3 Rehabilitation of parks</b>			
	Lubombo TFCA	<p><u>Futi Corridor :</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Construction of staff houses</li> <li>● Road and track rehabilitation and construction (10km)</li> <li>● Vehicles and equipment for park staff</li> </ul> <p><u>MER:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Rehabilitation of main camp</li> <li>● Construction of posts</li> <li>● Construction of field housing</li> <li>● Road rehabilitation and construction (25km)</li> <li>● Vehicle and equipment for staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Some staff houses were built</li> <li>● Roads and tracks have been restored</li> <li>● Most vehicles and equipment procured</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Staff houses, posts and main camp were built</li> <li>● Roads were rehabilitated</li> <li>● Most vehicles and equipment procured</li> </ul>
	Great Limpopo TFCA	<p><u>Limpopo NP :</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Rehabilitation and construction of guard posts</li> <li>● Vehicles and equipment</li> </ul> <p><u>Banhine NP :</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Construction of posts and rehabilitation of staff houses</li> <li>● Vehicles and equipment</li> <li>● Road rehabilitation and construction (10km)</li> </ul> <p><u>Zinave NP :</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Construction of posts</li> <li>● Rehabilitation of main camp</li> <li>● Vehicle and equipment</li> <li>● Road rehabilitation and construction (10km)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Construction of posts done</li> <li>● Most of the equipment was procured</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Construction and rehabilitation of staff houses and posts done</li> <li>● Most of the equipment was procured</li> <li>● Some roads and tracks have been restored</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Construction of staff houses and posts done</li> <li>● Most of the equipment was procured</li> <li>● Some roads and tracks have been restored</li> </ul>
	Chimanimani TFCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Rehabilitation and construction of guard posts</li> <li>● Vehicles and equipment</li> <li>● Road rehabilitation and construction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Construction and rehabilitation of staff houses and posts done.</li> <li>● Most of the vehicles and equipment were procured.</li> <li>● Roads to key tourist attractions were opened/rehabilitated.</li> </ul>
<b>COMPONENT 3. COMMUNITY MOBILIZATION AND PILOT PROGRAMS</b>			
	Lubombo TFCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Funds for urgent wildlife/community conflicts</li> <li>● Community conservation investment fund</li> <li>● Capacity building for local NGOs</li> <li>● Community support training</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Rice production project was funded for Madjedjane community in Maputo river basin</li> <li>● Policy and guidelines for communities in PAs in progress</li> <li>● Community activity prepared (bee-keeping) but not implemented because of lack of funding</li> <li>● Proposal for community development are done</li> </ul>

		<p>for personnel and for communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Community awareness exchange program (CAMPFIRE)</li> <li>● Facilitation of land acquisition for communities along the west side of the FC</li> </ul>	<p>and ready to be implemented</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Community awareness and training was carried out</li> <li>● Community land titles given (over 45,000 ha demarcated for communities).</li> </ul>
	Great Limpopo TFCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Community awareness</li> <li>● Community development activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Community awareness exchange carried out</li> <li>● Community activity (Catine) prepared but not implemented because of lack of funding</li> <li>● Demarcation of land for communities (over 26,000 ha)</li> <li>● Some community land titles have been given outside the NPs</li> </ul>
	Chimanimani TFCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Community support training for personnel and for communities</li> <li>● Community awareness exchange program (CAMPFIRE)</li> <li>● Regional visits for community leaders</li> <li>● Workshops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Land for communities demarcated (6 villages)</li> <li>● Declaration of historical cultural use zones done (18 sites)</li> <li>● CBNRM activities occurred (bee-keeping, saw-milling, community shop and grind mill operation, mushroom harvesting and marketing, and small-scale agriculture) in 6 communities</li> <li>● Community representatives went on a study tour to Uganda and to Tete province</li> </ul>
<b>COMPONENT 4. MONITORING AND EVALUATION</b>			
	Design and implement M&E system	<p>M&amp;E system must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● institutional strengthening / policy changes</li> <li>● ecological monitoring</li> <li>● socio-economic and community assessments</li> <li>● project implementation and accountability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Guidelines for M&amp;E were drafted but were not implemented due to their complexity and to the lack of capacity at the local level.</li> </ul>

## Annex 2. Project Costs and Financing

### Project Cost by Component (in US\$ million equivalent)

Component	Appraisal Estimate US\$ million	Actual/Latest Estimate US\$ million	Percentage of Appraisal
A. Institutional Strengthening	3.38	2.32	68
B. Habitat and Wildlife Management	1.71	1.59	93
C. Community Mobilization and Pilot Activities	1.59	0.81	50
D. Monitoring and Evaluation	0.30	0.02	7
E. Unallocated	0.46		
<b>Total Baseline Cost</b>	7.44	4.74	
<b>Physical Contingencies</b>	0.53		
<b>Price Contingencies</b>	0.15		
<b>Total Project Costs</b> Interest during construction	8.12	4.74	
<b>Total Financing Required</b>	8.12	4.74	

### Project Costs by Procurement Arrangements (Appraisal Estimate) (US\$ million equivalent)

Expenditure Category	Procurement Method <sup>1</sup>			N.B.F.	Total Cost
	ICB	NCB	Other <sup>2</sup>		
<b>1. Works</b>	0.00 (0.00)	0.15 (0.15)	0.00 (0.00)	0.50 (0.00)	0.65 (0.15)
<b>2. Goods</b>	0.30 (0.30)	0.25 (0.25)	0.10 (0.10)	0.50 (0.00)	1.15 (0.65)
<b>3. Services</b>	0.00	0.00	2.70	0.80	3.50
<b>TA, training and studies</b>	(0.00)	(0.00)	(2.70)	(0.00)	(2.70)
<b>4. Community Pilot Activities</b>	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.30 (0.30)	0.20 (0.00)	0.50 (0.30)
<b>5. Incremental Operating Costs</b>	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	1.70 (1.20)	0.70 (0.00)	2.40 (1.20)
<b>6. Miscellaneous</b>	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
<b>Total</b>	0.30 (0.30)	0.40 (0.40)	4.80 (4.30)	2.70 (0.00)	8.20 (5.00)

### Project Costs by Procurement Arrangements (Actual/Latest Estimate) (US\$ million equivalent)

Expenditure Category	Procurement Method <sup>1</sup>			N.B.F.	Total Cost
	ICB	NCB	Other <sup>2</sup>		
<b>1. Works</b>	0.00 (0.00)	0.04 (0.04)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.04 (0.04)
<b>2. Goods</b>	0.08	0.58	0.14	0.00	0.80

	(0.08)	(0.58)	(0.14)	(0.00)	(0.80)
<b>3. Services</b>	0.96	0.68	0.45	0.00	2.09
<b>TA, training and studies</b>	(0.96)	(0.68)	(0.45)	(0.00)	(2.09)
<b>4. Community Pilot Activities</b>	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.33
	(0.00)	(0.33)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.33)
<b>5. Incremental Operating Costs</b>	0.00	0.00	1.43	0.00	1.43
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(1.43)	(0.00)	(1.43)
<b>6. Miscellaneous</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
<b>Total</b>	1.04	1.63	2.02	0.00	4.69
	(1.04)	(1.63)	(2.02)	(0.00)	(4.69)

<sup>1/</sup> Figures in parenthesis are the amounts to be financed by the Bank Loan. All costs include contingencies.

<sup>2/</sup> Includes civil works and goods to be procured through national shopping, consulting services, services of contracted staff of the project management office, training, technical assistance services, and incremental operating costs related to (i) managing the project, and (ii) re-lending project funds to local government units.

#### Project Financing by Component (in US\$ million equivalent)

Component	Appraisal Estimate			Actual/Latest Estimate			Percentage of Appraisal		
	Bank	Govt.	CoF.	Bank	Govt.	CoF.	Bank	Govt.	CoF.
<b>Institutional strengthening</b>	3.38			2.32			68.6		
<b>Habitat and wildlife management</b>	1.71			1.59			93.0		
<b>Community mobilization and pilot activities</b>	1.59			0.81			50.9		
<b>Monitoring and evaluation</b>	0.30			0.02			6.7		

### **Annex 3. Economic Costs and Benefits**

No economic analysis has been carried out. See 4.3 for discussion on economic issues.

## Annex 4. Bank Inputs

(a) Missions:

Stage of Project Cycle	No. of Persons and Specialty (e.g. 2 Economists, 1 FMS, etc.)		Performance Rating		
	Month/Year	Count	Specialty	Implementation Progress	Development Objective
<b>Identification/Preparation</b>					
March 1991	1	Task Team Leader, Ag. Economist			
Sept. 1991	1	Task Team Leader, Ag. Economist			
	2	Economist			
	1	Conservation Planners			
	1	Institutional/Training Specialist			
	1	Nat Resources Economist			
July 1992	1	Task Team Leader, Ag. Economist			
	1	Env. Specialist			
Nov. 1992	2	Economists			
	2	Conservation Planners			
	1	Institutional/Training Specialist			
May 1994	1	Task Team Leader, Economist			
	1	Sociologist			
	1	Env. Officer			
<b>Appraisal/Negotiation</b>					
July 1996	1	Task Team Leader, Economist			
	1	NRM			
	1	Lawyer			
	1	Procurement/Disbursement			
	1	Program Officer			
	1	Operations Analyst			
<b>Supervision</b>					
Supervision data from July 1996 to December 2000 is missing; however, supervision was mainly carried out from the field.			S	S	
December 2000	1	Task Team Leader, NRM	S	S	
	1	Sociologist			
	1	Community Dev.			
	1	Disbursement			
February 2001	1	Task Team Leader, NRM	S	S	
February 2002	1	Task Team Leader, Economist	S	S	
	1	NRM			
	1	GEF Coordinator			
	1				
October 2002	1	Task Team Leader, Economist	S	S	



	March 2003	1	NRM		
		1	Financial Management		
		1	Disbursement/Procurement		
		1	Task Team Leader, Economist	S	S
		1	NRM		
		1	Environment		
		1	Financial Management		
		1	Disbursement/Procurement		
		1	Env. Economist		
<b>ICR</b>	January 2004	1	Task Team Leader		S
		1	Environment		

(b) Staff:

Stage of Project Cycle	Actual/Latest Estimate	
	No. Staff weeks	US\$ ('000)
Identification/Preparation	32,4	104.3
Appraisal/Negotiation	34.0	75.8
Supervision	69.17	752.0
ICR	18.48	28.4
Total	154.05	960.5

## Annex 5. Ratings for Achievement of Objectives/Outputs of Components

(H=High, SU=Substantial, M=Modest, N=Negligible, NA=Not Applicable)

	<u>Rating</u>				
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Macro policies</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Sector Policies</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Physical</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Financial</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Institutional Development</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Environmental</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<i>Social</i>					
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poverty Reduction</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input checked="" type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Gender</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other (Please specify)</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Private sector development</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input checked="" type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Public sector management</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input checked="" type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other (Please specify)</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA

## Annex 6. Ratings of Bank and Borrower Performance

(HS=Highly Satisfactory, S=Satisfactory, U=Unsatisfactory, HU=Highly Unsatisfactory)

### 6.1 Bank performance

#### Rating

- |                                      |                          |                                    |                                    |                          |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lending     | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input type="radio"/> S            | <input checked="" type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Supervision | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U            | <input type="radio"/> HU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Overall     | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U            | <input type="radio"/> HU |

### 6.2 Borrower performance

#### Rating

- |  |                          |                                    |                         |                          |
|--|--------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Preparation                           | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Government implementation performance | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation agency performance     | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Overall                               | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |

## **Annex 7. List of Supporting Documents**

1. Project Document
2. Mid-term Review
3. Aide-Memoirs
4. PSR 1 – 15
5. Mozambique CAS (2000), CAS (1997), CAS (1995)
6. World Bank (1998) Rebuilding the Mozambique Economy. Country Assistance Review. OED
7. A full list of the 172 documents relating to the project is available in the project file.

## **Additional Annex 8. Borrower's Project Completion Report**

### **Introduction**

The Transfrontier Conservation Areas Project (TFCA) was funded by a grant from the Global Environmental Facility and was administered by the World Bank. This project became effective in June 1997 and was designed for a period of 5 years. However in 2002 the project was extended to September 2003. It was implemented on behalf of the Mozambican Government initially (from 1997-2000) by the National Directorate of Forestry and Wildlife in the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries. The project was transferred in 2000 to the Ministry of Tourism where it was implemented until September 2003. This project was designed to assist the Government of Mozambique in creating enabling policy and institutional frameworks for rehabilitating, developing, conserving and sustainably utilizing its forest and wildlife resources. The aim was to integrate biodiversity conservation with economic development based on sustainable use of forest and wildlife resources.

### **Principal performance ratings**

Irrespective of inadequate government capacity, the process of transfer of the project from the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries to the Ministry of Tourism and the disruption that this caused, implementation of the TFCA project's objectives can be rated as satisfactory. This project has helped to stimulate a great interest in Transfrontier conservation and transboundary natural resource management (TBNRM) in southern Africa. However, it should be noted that this project was the first of its kind in southern Africa, hence a lot, especially gaining national and international consensus. The development of institutional framework for coordinating the establishment and development of TFCAs had to be learnt during implementation of the project and this took a long time. The implementation of the Community Mobilization component was not satisfactory because local NGOs entrusted with the responsibility of implementing this component had inadequate capacity to create sufficient incentives for communities to adopt nature conservation as an adjunct to their subsistence livelihoods. Although some land was demarcated for communities, little value was added, and there was no joint venture deal accomplished between the private sector and communities, hence poverty remains rife among the communities in TFCAs.

#### **A. Assessment of Development objectives, Design and Quality at Entry**

The first phase of the Pilot TFCA project was designed as a long-term effort that would extend at least for 10-15 years. Its thrust has been to assist the Government of Mozambique to create an enabling policy and institutional environment for rehabilitating, conserving its unique natural and biodiversity endowments, using the TFCA as the central organizing principle, and help implement community-based resource management in three pilot TFCAs, namely Chimanmani, Gaza (currently known as Great Limpopo TFCA) and Maputo (known as Lubombo TFCA).

The project had four inter-related objectives, namely:

- i) Institutional and policy development, which included capacity building of staff of the Directorate of Forestry and Wildlife, its provincial services, District Agricultural Services and local communities;
- ii) Habitat and Wildlife Management
- iii) Community mobilization; and
- iv) Monitoring and Evaluation

From a design point of view the project fully recognized inadequate capacities within the government to adequately foster sustainable biodiversity conservation at a trans-border, and ecosystem-wide scale, and promote sustained rural development, hence acknowledgment of the need for donor support for 10-15 years. However while the project also emphasized the role of NGOs to promote Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) and the need to apply CBNRM lessons learned from neighboring countries, the reality proved difficult in achieving these because:

- During the course of implementing the project it became apparent that local NGOs in Mozambique lack

capacity to facilitate effective CBNRM programs, and had been unable to form alliances that could have boosted their capacities. In addition CBNRM in the neighboring countries is still on experimental basis; hence no real useful lessons could be discerned from them. Even the popular CAMPFIRE program in Zimbabwe for example has had some flaws with its revenue-sharing approach, whereby government authorities act as contracting agents, collect and distribute revenues generated to communities. Rural District Councils have been capturing most of these revenues. Furthermore while CBNRM in neighboring countries is based on sport hunting of abundant wildlife, in Mozambique wildlife populations were decimated during the protracted civil war, hence new models of CBNRM, that are based on local situation could be most suitable, but unfortunately the NGOs that were entrusted with this task had no idea of how to do it.

- The identified pilot TFCA's are in remote areas, where basic infrastructure (even in Maputo where there are some structures, they are in terrible state) does not exist. The budget for rehabilitation of protected areas was excessively inadequate, more particularly so as there were no structures to rehabilitate. What was really required was re-construction of infrastructure in protected wildlife areas. The situation of infrastructure was aggravated by floods in 2000, which washed away the little that existed in protected areas of Maputo and Gaza provinces. Viable markets do not exist, partly because of lack of access. Similarly, Pilot TFCA's are inaccessible, hence limiting the private sector and communities' ability to engage in sustainable business ventures. In the proposed follow-up phase of the TFCA, these shortfalls have been recognized.

## **B. Achievement of Development Objectives and outputs**

Some good progress has been made in most of the project's components. Notable in this regard include:

### **1. Institutional strengthening and policy development**

The TFCA Project document (GEF/World Bank, 1996) identifies the following key areas, as being the target under institutional strengthening and policy development at four levels, (*i.e.*, Directorate for Forestry and Wildlife (DNFFB), Provincial Services for Forestry and Wildlife (SPFFB), District Agricultural Services (DDA) and Local Communities

#### **1.1. Technical Assistance and Project Co-ordination**

To boost DNFFB's capacity to implement the TFCA project, the following personnel had been recruited on contract basis:

- Project Manager - Mozambican, seconded by DNFFB
- Chief Technical Advisor – expatriate. Was involved in the project from January 1998 to February 2003.
- Technical Advisor for Gaza – expatriate. Gaza had two technical advisors (the first from 1997-1998, the second from 1999-2000) both resigned due to hardships faced while working in Gaza, and alleged lack of support from the provincial Agricultural Services in Xai-Xai, where they were based
- Technical Advisor for Lubombo TFCA- expatriate. Lubombo too has had two technical advisors. The first had a years' input in 1999, but his contract was not renewed. The second, resigned in December 2002.
- Financial Controller- Mozambican
- Project Administrator, TFCA Headquarters - Mozambican
- Three Project Accountants (one each Gaza, Inhambane, Manica) - Mozambicans
- Three Provincial Coordinators (These were seconded by the DNFFB, and did not draw salary from the project) - Mozambicans

##### **1.1.1 Defining job descriptions for the DNFFB personnel**

One of the weaknesses identified during the time of implementing the TFCA project was the inability by most technical personnel to perform to the expected standards, due to lack of clear terms of reference concomitant with their positions in DNFFB. To resolve this problem, the TFCA project's team developed job descriptions for the key personnel, such as the Heads of Departments, and Game Wardens and issued them as guidelines for these officers

to use in accomplishing their functions.

## 1.2. Logistical support

### 1.2.1 Equipment

A variety of equipment were purchased to enhance the performance of both staff at DNFFB headquarters and its provincial services, including the Wardens of the protected wildlife areas.

## 1.3 Training

The TFCA project log frame and Project Implementation Plan (PIP) identified the following target-personnel for training:

### 1.3.1 DNFFB Headquarters Staff

Course	Institution	1st verifier	2nd verifier
		Number trained	No. of training man-days
Msc. Natural Resource Management	University of Natal	1	270
Bsc. GIS Applications (This is a four years course, but so far the TFCA project has paid fees for a year, and will continue supporting the candidate in the subsequent years)	University of Pretoria	1	270
Financial Management	SAWC Southern African Wildlife College, South Africa	2	10
Project cycle management	SAWC	1	5
Human Resource Management	SAWC	1	5
Rangers Guide	SAWC	1	21
CITES Management	Portugal	1	15
GIS Operation (the support was mainly in terms of per diems)	Portugal	3	270
<b>Total</b>		11	866

At DNFFB's level - officers from diverse backgrounds participated in short-term training. These included financial administrators, wildlife managers, CITES desk officer, departmental lawyer, departmental planner and *GIS* technicians. Besides these, two officers were sponsored by the TFCA project to study for BSc and MSc. The MSc student evaluated the effectiveness of the extant Forest and Wildlife Policy in fostering private sector and local community participation in the business investment and management of forest and wildlife resources in Mozambique. The BSc. student was trained in basic *GIS* applications. The GEF/World Bank Project Document recommends among other things that the *GIS* applications should be integrated into planning and development activities, including community area management, law enforcement and monitoring and evaluation. However, lack of capacity within DNFFB, with regards to technical know-how, and therefore effectiveness to apply *GIS* technology into various activities as suggested was over-looked during the project preparatory phase. The logical sequence adopted by the TFCA project was first to train the officers that would be managing the *GIS* unit. No *GIS* equipment was procured because the unit already had them but expertise was what was lacking.

The following skills were gained from the various short-term training courses:

#### a) Financial Management

- Application of principles of financial management;
- Compiling balance sheets by using appropriate ratio analysis;
- Interpretation of financial statements; and
- Prudent financial management by DNFFB.

**(b) Human Resource Management**

- Skills necessary for effective management;
- Labor relations and their role in effective human resource management;
- Requisite for effective human resource management, such as training needs assessment, job evaluation, grievance handling, selection interviews, etc; and
- Motivation factors required in promoting productivity at the work places.

**(c) Rangers field Guide**

This course provided practical and theoretical field skills, such as:

- practical survival skills in the wild;
- effective weapon handling skills;
- effective first aid skills;
- application of some key concepts of wildlife management, preventive maintenance and others;
- techniques of trails guiding; and
- Professional out-look in the fieldwork

**(d) CITES management**

- Knowledge of CITES Appendix listing, and submission of CITES reports.

**(e) GIS Applications**

- Basic knowledge of using software for map production and map interpretations.

**1.3.2 SPFFB Staff**

Course	Institution	1st verifier	2nd verifier
		Number trained	No. of Training man-days
BSc Business studies	UNISA	1	540
Human resource management	SAWC	2	10
Project cycle management	SAWC	4	20
Economics of natural resources	SAWC	1	5
Facilitation & communication	SAWC	2	10
Community based natural resource management	SAWC	2	10
Public relations	SAWC	1	5
Financial management	SAWC	2	10
Communication & Facilitation Skills	SAWC	2	10



English proficiency	UEM	12	1080
<b>Total</b>		29	1700

At SPFFB level, a number of officers also participated in short-term training. One officer from Gaza obtained a BA degree in Business studies, a qualification that was relevant for DNFFB which was in the process of integrating the private sector in the development and management of forest and wildlife resources.

The major constraint in finding candidates for training was language - all short - term courses were offered in English, and as most Mozambican civil servants speak Portuguese, it was hard for them to participate in the offered training. Irrespective of this, the following skills were gained at Provincial level through short-term courses:

**(a) Financial Management**

- application of principles of financial management;
- compiling balance sheets by using appropriate ratio analysis;
- interpretation of financial statements; and
- prudent financial management.

**(b) Human Resource Management**

- general principles of human resources management;
- skills necessary for effective management;
- operations of an organization within the framework of the external and internal environment;
- labor relations and their role in effective human resource management;
- training needs assessment, job evaluation, grievance handling, selection interviews, etc; and
- motivation factors required in promoting productivity at the work places.

**(c) Communication and Facilitation Skills**

This course was particularly important for DNFFB, which is embarking on an extensive campaign to win the co-operation of local communities in the conservation of the Mozambique's rich biodiversity. The participants gained an understanding of:

- the nature of facilitation;
- situations where facilitation is necessary;
- facilitation skills through popular participatory methods;
- group dynamics, and ability to develop strategies and plans for learning and capacity building at the work places.

**(d) Community based eco-tourism**

- An understanding of community based eco-tourism;
- Examined case studies, concepts of community based eco-tourism and identified their key components.

**(e) Project cycle management**

- Project identification, designing and implementation; and
- Project analysis, monitoring and evaluation

**(f) English proficiency**

A number of high and medium level personnel took short-term English proficiency courses, through the Institute of

Languages, University of Edward Mondlane and private schools. This greatly enhanced their ability to communicate with the nature conservation officials in the neighboring countries, with whom they collaborated in implementing the TFCA project. This course mainly focused at teaching the trainees English grammar and how to speak and write English.

**(g) Economics of natural resources**

- valuation tools for assessing the values of wildlife;
- protected areas planning and management; and
- tools of analyzing economics of wildlife resources.

**(h) Public relations**

- Communication skills;
- Report writing and presentation;
- Publicity and advertising; and
- Methods of effective public relations and marketing.

**(i) Community based natural resource management**

- Conceptualization of the framework for CBNRM;
- Policy and legislation issues;
- Indigenous knowledge;
- Lessons learned in CBNRM in SADC;
- Co-management models;
- Stakeholder analysis; and
- Institutional structures.

**1.3.3 Local Authorities and DDA Staff**

		<b>1st verifier</b>	<b>2nd verifier</b>
Course	Institution	Number trained	No. Training man-days
Community Based Eco-tourism	SAWC	1	5
Game Guard/law enforcement	MER	27	810
Game Guard/law enforcement	Gorongosa N. Park	22	1320
Diploma in Wildlife Management (this scholarship has been funded by SADC Wildlife Sector)	Mweka College	1	270
<b>Total</b>		61	2405

**1.3.4 Local Communities**

		<b>Ist verifier</b>	<b>2nd verifier</b>
Course	Institution	Number trained	No. of training man-days
Mushroom processing, preservation & marketing	Study tour to Uganda by community representatives from Chimanimani	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>
Community based natural resource management (CBNRM)	Study tour to Chuma Tchato, Tete Province by community representatives from Chimanimani	<b>6</b>	<b>30</b>

Community representatives from Chimanimani TFCA undertook most of the study tours during the project implementation. Most of these were funded by the Ford Foundation, assisted by two indigenous NGOs – AMRU and ORAM. Skills gained by Chimanimani communities include bee-keeping, and processing and marketing of mushrooms.

### 1.3.5 Indigenous NGOs

		1st verifier	2nd verifier
	Institution	Number trained	No. of training man-days
Certificate in wildlife management - an officer from ORAM	SAWC	1	270
Mushroom processing, preservation & marketing	Study tour by AMRU-Chimanimani to Uganda sponsored by Ford Foundation	1	7

#### 1.3.5.1 Constraints encountered in implementing the training program

Although the TFCA Project Implementation Plan (PIP) and the log frame identified the categories (DNFFB, SPFFB, etc) to be trained, the numbers that could be trained were not specified in the log-frame. Furthermore, training-needs assessment to identify:

- the officers that require further training;
- the type and level of training; and
- the institutions where these officers could be trained was not done. Consequently, nomination of officers for training was on an *ad hoc* basis.

### 1.4 Establishment of the GIS Unit

The TFCA project assisted in:

- Evaluating the capacity of the existing *Monitoring and Evaluation Unit* of the DNFFB;
- Identifying *GIS* functions/uses that were required;
- Defining *GIS* system requirements;
- Defining the flow of information;
- Identifying other *GIS* systems in place to ensure compatibility;
- Identifying the future *GIS* applications by the DNFFB;
- Defining requirements for personnel, in terms of number and qualifications;
- Defining type of training required, and associated costs; and
- Defining type of equipment – hardware and software required and costs.

The necessary equipment existed, but there was lack of trained personnel. Consequently the project invested in training. One officer was trained at MSc level, sponsored by other donors, while the other was funded by the TFCA project, studying for a 4 years BSc, in information technology, including GIS. Since these courses were of long term in nature, their impacts could not be measured during the project life.

### 1.5 Enhancing the role of the private sector

- (i) This sub-component successfully accomplished:
  - A survey of the private sector currently involved in wildlife based business in Mozambique was done
  - revised safari hunting fees in Coutadas
  - developed Tender Guidelines that should foster transparency in awarding concessions in TFCA;

(ii) **Support for international collaboration in the establishment of TFCA** – Mozambique played a key role in facilitating the process of establishing TFCAs. Agreements for all TFCAs were signed during the project life. At a national level, the proposed national co-ordination framework for the TFCA first phase included:

- National - Level Steering Committee, chaired by the Minister of Agriculture, or his designee. Proposed members of this committee included key public sector agencies, (such as MICOA, DINATUR, DINAP, INDER, Foreign Affairs, and Ministry of Interior), University of Edward Mondlane and representatives of developmental NGOs;
- Technical Committee;
- Provincial Co-ordination Committee; and
- Joint Management Committees in which local communities were to be represented.

During implementation of Phase one, some modifications were made. For instance, at TFCA-specific level, international committees were formed comprising the:

- Ministerial Committees;
- Technical Committees; and
- A wide spectrum of Working Groups, each representing different national and international stakeholders.

At a national level, a functional *Tourism Facilitation Committee* was formed, comprising ministers from key public sector agencies, which *inter alia* deals with TFCA development issues. This committee was supported by a *Tourism Facilitation Subcommittee*, composed of National Directors of the key public sector agencies supports this committee. In addition to these, some TFCAs, such as Chimanmani, had established Provincial Co-ordination and Joint Management Committees. The latter has community representation at grass-root level. Besides these, three more co-ordination frameworks for TFCA development were formed, namely:

- The Elephant Coast Development Authority formed for the Matutuine District, part of the Lubombo TFCA, which aims at achieving the project's objective of stimulating responsible tourism and community empowerment and participation and form sustainable partnerships among the local communities, private sector, NGOs, and government.
- The Lubombo Spatial Development Initiative - Transfrontier Conservation Areas Technical Commission and Task Groups (also for Lubombo TFCA, comprising Ponta de Ouro/Kosy Bay, Tembe/Ndumo/Futi and Goba Mulaula)and
- The TFCA Unit, which has been established in the Ministry of Tourism under the Minister, to provide:
  - a streamlined TFCA administration;
  - effective technical responses and inputs at all levels of TFCA development and management; and
  - a rapid response framework on all decisions pertaining to national, and international TFCA development .

The specific tasks of the TFCA Unit include:

- i) liaising with national stakeholders, including the Spatial Development Initiatives (SDIs) in planning and developing a National Programme of Action for TFCA development;
- ii) coordinating and facilitating national TFCA development activities;
- iii) coordinating and collaborating with neighboring countries in implementing cross-border TFCA activities;
- iv) preparing TFCA development proposals and contacting donor agencies for funding;
- v) preparing progress reports for MITUR, donors supporting the TFCA initiative, and other relevant stakeholders;
- vi) liaising with TFCA Secretariats in neighboring states in the preparation for the TFCA Ministerial meetings;
- vii) maintaining a database on TFCA development in Mozambique and the SADC region; and
- viii) exploring the possibility of expanding the activities of the TFCA Unit, in order to improve its effectiveness and efficiency.

The TFCA Unit is actually (from November 2002) taking the role of coordinating the activities within the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park. This task is taken as implementation of the Treaty signed between the three countries,

which allows that there will be a coordinating country which will play the role for a period of two years in a rotational base. The Unit has mobilized support from the Peace Parks Foundation and the KfW to undertake the task.

### ***Institutional bottleneck encountered during the project implementation***

The splitting of authority and mandate for wildlife conservation between the two ministries, of Agriculture, and Tourism. The former is responsible for wildlife occurring on customary land and Forest Reserves, while the latter is responsible for wildlife in National Reserves, Parks and Controlled Hunting Areas. TFCAs encompass both protected areas and communal lands and therefore, wildlife occurring in TFCAs fall under the two ministerial jurisdictions. The possibility of streamlining jurisdiction of wildlife management occurring in TFCAs was not accomplished during phase one of the project, but it is necessary.

**(iii) Policy and legislation review** – the TFCA project has contributed to the review of the Forestry and Wildlife Legislation, and identification of gaps that need to be amended to allow for local community and private sector full participation in the development of TFCAs. Progress has also been made on a number of other key policy fronts where the project itself has been the catalyst for policy change and dialogue on (i) people in protected areas and (ii) private sector participation. Guidelines for transparent selection of investors in TFCAs have been developed.

**2. Habitat and Wildlife Management** - The project mainly targeted the development of resource management plans, allocation of management personal, rehabilitation of infrastructure, mainly buildings for staff and office accommodation, improvement of law enforcement and wildlife surveys.

Area-specific achievements include:

**(a) Lubombo TFCA.** Despite the fact that the SDC withdrew their pledged funding, the following were accomplished:

- Revised the Maputo Special Reserve (MSR) management plan
- Developed the Futi Corridor plan, that gives a framework for linking MSR with Tembe and Nduma of South Africa
- Recommended establishment of a Management Board for MSR to improve its management
- Developed a proposal for eco-tourism development
- Strengthened law enforcement; and
- Coordinated elephant surveys by University of Pretoria and Edward Mondlane

#### ***Constraints***

- The project could not proceed speedily with a number of actions due to DNFFB delays in giving approvals. Even when the project was transferred to the Ministry of Tourism there was a time lag before a TFCA Unit was established to deal with all TFCA issues;
- The Lubombo SDI protocol under which framework the TFCA agreement was signed was not functional because the commission, secretariat and task groups were not formed by the governments. By the end of the project, there were no cross-border actions being implemented in the Lubombo TFCA, due to inertia in South Africa and Swaziland.
- Numerous complaints were lodged regarding the poor performance of the Management team in the Maputo Special Reserve. This being a high profile reserve, it should have been in the interest of the Directorate of Conservation Areas (DNAC) to assign a more committed and trust-worthy manager to this reserve. A new manager was deployed to the reserve during the last quarter of the project life.
- Poor provincial co-ordination. There was no full time project coordinator at provincial level. The coordinator was also accumulating the responsibility of heading of SPFFB. When the project was transferred in 2000 from Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development to the Ministry of Tourism, the role of coordinating activities of Maputo were transferred to the project manager because there was no Provincial Directorate of Tourism to house the project.

**(b) Banhine and Zinave National Parks** – achievements include:

- Established administration and law enforcement
- Development of conceptual plans, which advocated formation of consortiums – comprising government, private sector and communities which could have been responsible for the development and management of the protected areas
- Reconnaissance surveys, which provided an overview of the landscapes and relic wildlife
- Construction of some traditional staff houses
- Development of plans for rehabilitation of staff houses and offices
- Procurement and installation of water pumps
- Opening of roads, and clearing some parts of protected areas' boundaries
- Installation of communication radios
- Provision of transport for management work
- Introduction of early burning policy
- Training of Game Guards; and monitoring of wildlife recovery

***Constraints***

- Weak provincial co-ordination of the project in Gaza;
- Floods slowed down progress
- Excessive vehicle break downs
- Poor and lack of infrastructure
- Logistics for Banhine are costly due to poor road and remoteness of the area
- Lack of DNFFB's support and approval of the conceptual plans which are now obsolete
- Inadequate funds allocated by the World Bank for rehabilitation of staff houses and office accommodation

**(c) Coutada 16** – changed status from a hunting area to a national park (Limpopo National Park in 2001). The TFCA project was instrumental in coordinating all the new development initiatives, including winning SADC's endorsement of the KfW project. The project also trained the first team of ten law enforcement guards for Coutada 16. The project also initiated some ecological monitoring work. The main constraint in Coutada 16 was poor development by the private sector operating in the area, consequently little if any benefits accrued to the local communities resident in the area. The company also did not invest in law enforcement. SPFFB had no capacity to monitor compliance with hunting quotas, and quotas were being issued on an *ad hoc* basis – with no information on the status of the resource base.

The project is involved at Steering Committee level in the development of Limpopo National Park with funding from the KfW.

**(d) Chimanimani** – the World Bank/TFCA document recommended for the development of a resource management plan and establishment of a core protected area. The resource management plan was developed in 1999. This recommended a creation of a Biosphere Reserve taking into account a mosaic of land use. The project took lead in the process of proclamation of Chimanimani National Reserve (2003), demarcation of community land, implementation of income generating activities such as bee-keeping and mushrooms collection and declaration of 19 Historic Cultural Use Zones (2003). In addition, the TFCA project:

- Opened roads to key attractions
- Established a functional regional coordination committee, composed by government, private sector and NGO's that was meeting in Chimoio
- Established functional joint management committees that were meeting at local level
- Trained community guards
- Established Game Guards' camps
- Installed communication radios

- Provided transport for resource management operations

#### **Constraints**

- DNFFB never processed the approval of the developed resource management plan. It is hoped that DNAC will as a matter of urgency process its approval. The plan contains excellent programmes for Community controlled natural resource management options
  - The management plan is not being implemented, opening room for an *ad hoc* approach to resource management in Chimanimani. This is partly due to the fact that it has not been approved
- (e) **Interstitial areas** – a detailed land use plan was developed outlining potential sustainable land use options for the land outside protected areas in the Great Limpopo TFCA. This plan also unveils opportunities for community based natural resource management.

The plan is currently being discussed and studied at local level to facilitate its implementation

**3. Community Mobilization** – this component has been the weakest of all. The World Bank/TFCA document proposed subcontracting this component to NGOs, but what was achieved is not satisfactory.

(i) **In Lubombo TFCA** – Helvetas, a Swiss NGO was supposed to carry out CBNRM work but little was accomplished besides some public awareness about the new land law. Apart of that the Helvetas facilitated the acquisition of land certificates for two communities living in the northern part of the Maputo Special Reserve. Helvetas did not implement any income generating activity. Note, no TFCA money was given to Helvetas to carry out CBNRM work, hence, any work they did was done at their own discretion. The TFCA after finding the proposal from Helvetas to facilitate the process of consultation on the process of declaring the FUTI corridor very expensive, it decided to use the staff of government to do so. As the process was successful the project also carried on facilitating the process of land acquisition for local communities (about 20.000 ha) along the west side of the proposed Futi corridor. The project financed the Madjedjane community on a project of plantation of rice in the basin of Maputo River. The Madjedjane community is working with an local NGO the Foundation for Development of Community (FDC) who helped the Madjedjane community developing the project which would contribute to help people shift from hunting and collection of firewood as livelihood to plantation of rice.

(ii) **Gaza TFCA** – IUCN-Mozambique was contracted to implement CBNRM work in some pilot areas in Coutada 16 and Banhine. Its accomplishments included:

- social-economic surveys
- facilitation of land acquisition for local communities around Banhine National Park ( 20.000 ha)

Trough the Provincial Directorate of Tourism the project supported the acquiring of 2.000 ha of land for community adjacent to Banhine National Park.

(iii) **Zinave** – Endangered Wildlife Trust - Mozambique (EWT) was implementing a small-scale CBNRM programme in Zinave National Park. It identified community needs, and focused its programme on bee-keeping, but very little was achieved with respect to income generation from beekeeping.

The EWT has also completed a process of acquisition of 10.000 ha of land for the local community of Zinave along the buffer zone

(iv) **Chimanimani** – had the most organized CBNRM programme. With financial support from Ford Foundation, communities were engaged in income generating activities, such as bee-keeping, saw-milling, community shop and grind mill operation, and mushroom harvesting and marketing. Small-scale irrigation agriculture was also being promoted. Various indigenous NGOs are facilitating CBNRM work in Chimanimani. Community representatives from Chimanimani also went on study tours, thus expanding their experiences in CBNRM. Furthermore, community land has been demarcated for the purpose of according them opportunities to engage in joint venture business, such as eco-tourism with the private investors. Unfortunately by the end of the project there was no private sector attracted to the area, despite some interest shown. The interest shown were not able to be accommodated because according to the project private sector had to be integrated using transparent

processes. The Framework for private sector investment was not ready and no tender process was established.

### **Constraints**

- Lack of capacity by local NGOs to carry out meaningful CBNRM work
  - Lack of capacity by DNFFB community unit to guide CBNRM activities. The Ministry of Tourism did not have any community unit and this caused further weakness as the community responsibility fell under the reduced staff of the project.
  - DNFFB never approved the Guidelines for CBNRM that were developed by the TFCA project.
4. **Monitoring and evaluation** - A consultant was hired to develop M&E for the project in December, 2001, and a workshop was held in early February 2002 to review the draft report. This report provides guidelines for monitoring and evaluating various components of the project. It is a useful tool that could be used even in the TFCA follow up phase.



## **Additional Annex 9. Additional requirements for GEF reporting**

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) has specific requirements for the terminal evaluations of projects they co-finance. The section below responds specifically to the questions raised in the guidelines: “Additional ICR guidelines for GEF projects” (as communicated by GEF staff).

### **(a) Implementation Approach**

GEF criteria for project selection have a slightly different focus to IDA or IBRD funded projects. Two differences relevant to this project are: (i) the greater encouragement of innovation; and (ii) the focus on the environment and biodiversity conservation. These two differences were even more pronounced when the project was designed than today. As stated in the ICR text, this project was very innovative. It developed a new approach to biodiversity conservation, and explored new linkages between conservation and community-based tourism. However, the innovative nature of the project meant that the project was exposed to more risks than regular projects. Clearly the high risk, high reward strategy (approved by the GEF) influenced the outcome of the project: the innovations that were successful, in particular, the regional collaboration were successful beyond expectations, and the weak components, for example, CBNRM, were weak. The same applies to the adaptive management approach encouraged under GEF projects: by encouraging the project to be responsive to the changing environment the project was able to capitalize on opportunities such as the International Treaties, and re-focus the CBNRM component on land demarcation. However, it also resulted in a lack of clarity in the minds of some govt. officials, and added to some of the slowness in implementation.

*Was the logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool?*

No logical framework was developed at the time of project design (this was not required by GEF). As discussed, no M&E system was implemented during the project.

*Assessment of the project’s adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management).*

The project adapted well to changing conditions. Its management changed during implementation from the MADER Ministry of Agriculture to MITUR the Ministry of Tourism. The way the project overcame several major constraints to project implementation - such as the withdrawal of funding by the SDC, the devaluation of the SDR, and the important floods that occurred in Mozambique in 2000 - demonstrates the adaptability skills of the project management team.

*Were effective partnership arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region? If not, which stakeholders were not effectively involved, why not and what impact did this have?*

Partnerships established by the project were successful, in particular, the regional collaboration between neighboring countries. The International Treaties and Agreements are testament to the success of these partnerships. However, some stakeholders were insufficiently involved in the process, in particular, the provincial and district authorities, and the local communities.

*Were lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation? If so, which?*

Experiences from other biodiversity and community-based natural resource management projects in Africa and elsewhere were used for the design of the TFCA project. These experiences revealed that success depends on engaging local communities in design and execution, that local capacity building is needed before substantial village-level investments can be made, that flexibility in design is also essential so that project activities can be readily modified on the basis of implementation experience, and that the private sector and NGOs must assume an important role in conservation and CBNRM due to budgetary restrictions of governments and donors. All of these lessons were considered in the design and implementation of the project; however, endemic conditions hindered the speed at which the experiences could be applied. The follow-on phase project, which is more technically and institutionally equipped and better financed, incorporates these lessons learned into the project design.

**(b) Country Ownership**

*Was the Project Concept consistent with national, sectoral or development plans?*

The project concept was consistent with GOM development plans, in particular, the National Environment Action Plan.

*Were relevant country representatives (e.g., government official, civil society, etc.) actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation?*

Relevant officials from MADER, and later MITUR and other Ministries were actively involved in all stages of the project. However, GOM interest in the project in the early stages was minimal and only picked up once the project started to reach implementation. Government interest in the project was mixed over the life of the project. The initial implementation of the project by MADER (DNFFB) was slow in progressing. The transfer of the project from MADER to MITUR caused substantial delays in the project due to unresolved institutional disputes. The failure to resolve these institutional conflicts caused the Bank to question the commitment of GOM to the project and the TFCA concept overall. However, once the issue was resolved, the clear commitment shown by MITUR towards the end of the project reversed this perception. Under the current arrangement, the project benefits from a high degree of positive involvement by senior government officials and appears to be a priority for GOM. The project experienced a slow release of counterpart funding for contract mobilization, however, all counterpart funding was released.

*Did the recipient government maintain financial commitment to the project?*

The full GOM counterpart funding was received by the project.

**(c) Public Involvement**

Within the scope of the second and third components of the project – habitat and wildlife management and community mobilization, some community awareness and sensitization activities were implemented. Prior to implementation of community activities and land demarcation, social surveys and workshops were carried out. Additionally, study tours and trainings with community representatives were given within the scope of the project. However, the approach was different and carried out by different agencies for each TFCA, and deemed not to be equally participatory oriented in each of the areas. Local and regional NGOs were contracted to prepare and implement some of the activities of the project. However, local governments were not sufficiently involved in the process. The institutional setup in which the project is located still has a top-down approach; however, the follow-on phase plans to decentralize authority to the provinces and districts.

**(d) Replication approach**

The project was designed as the first phase of a 10-15 year program, and was intended to create the enabling conditions for Mozambique to prepare and implement a conservation tourism strategy in partnership with donors and the private sector. In this context, the project has compiled a set of lessons learned from preparation and implementation of the pilot TFCA project, which serves directly the preparation of the follow up project i.e. Transfrontier Conservation Areas and Tourism Development Project. Important lessons learnt from the pilot project are listed in section 8.

**(e) Financial Planning**

Two factors resulted in significant costs changes: (i) at grant signing, SDC were expected to co-finance the project through a grant of \$2.6 million. However, SDC funds were never forthcoming, and therefore the budget was significantly reduced; (ii) the devaluation of the SDR resulted in a reduction in the project budget of \$300,000.

A specific weakness during supervision was the lack of adequate updates in many of the administrative project tracking devices required to manage Bank projects, including the PSRs (for example, no final PSR was completed). This has made it difficult for the ICR to fully capture all administrative and financial progress on the project. The data are included in the table on financial planning. Some delays from the World Bank in processing “no objections” were experienced in the project.

Financial management audits, procurement and disbursements have been verified on a regular basis by World Bank specialists in the country office. While some flaws were identified, related to invoices and other documents supporting disbursement transactions, accounting system, and segregation of duties, problems are being fixed within the preparation of the TFCATDP.

Leveraged resources

The project has been very successful in leveraging additional resources for the 3 TFCAs, for other TFCAs in the country and generally for the concept promoted by the project. The following investments have been made as result of the project:

- Private sector investment. As yet, very little private sector investment has been made in the sector; however, the project has assisted in establishing the enabling environment (both investment climate and nascent regulatory systems) for future investment;
- Donor funding. As a direct result of the project, KfW have provided a grant of EU6.1 (and have committed another EU5.8) to support the development of LNP (implemented by Peace Parks Foundation. (It is also regarded by KfW as a one of the most exciting current initiatives in conservation). USAID funds a project supporting the development of the Gaza TFCA (Gaza-Kruger-Gonarezhou Transboundary Natural Resources Management Initiative, \$3.5m grant implemented by DAI), and the Ford Foundation provided support to the Chimanimani TFCA for CBNRM. Other bilateral donors have also shown an interest in developing future projects; and
- Bank funding. The Bank are currently preparing the follow-on TFCA and Tourism Development Project (\$40m) which will explicitly follow-on from this project. IFC is also preparing a Tourism project (SEATIP) which is based largely on the work developed under this project.

The concept of transfrontier conservation developed and strengthened by this project has been adopted by

many governments, donors and NGOs in the region and the continent. Investments in this area have mushroomed and TFCAs are now regarded by both SADC and NEPAD as important mechanisms for tourism development, conservation and regional collaboration.

**(f) Cost-effectiveness**

The TFCFA project represented at the time the unique window of opportunity to protect areas of global biodiversity significance. It is possible that if the project had not been implemented, many of the TFCAs currently designated as PAs would not have been allocated for conservation. The project document asserts that due to severe financing limitations, if the GEF had not funded the project, activities envisaged under the project would not have taken place at all. Furthermore, after SDC funds were withdrawn, GEF became the essential financier of this operation, without which, none of the existing achievements would have happened.

The achievement of development objectives is satisfactory despite the fact that one part (CBNRM) was unsatisfactory, and another was modest (habitat and wildlife management) because the primary objective of creating an enabling policy and institutional environment has been achieved beyond expectations. The project was the first to establish and develop the concept of transfrontier conservation, which was subsequently adopted by other donors, SADC and NEPAD. The leverage that this relatively small project has been able to accomplish in attracting subsequent donor interest, and establishing a platform for future conservation programs is beyond even what was anticipated during the design phase. The project has added to a growing national, regional and global interest in the concept of transfrontier conservation areas as a way of combining objectives of conservation, community development, tourism and international cooperation.

**(g) Monitoring & evaluation**

A consultant was hired to develop M&E for the project in December, 2001, and a workshop was held in early February 2002 to review the draft report. This report provides guidelines for monitoring and evaluating various components of the project. It is a useful tool that could be used in the follow-on phase. Despite repeated requests from the Bank to design and implement an M&E system (this point was stressed in many aide memoir's and the mid-term review), no system was ever put in place. The design was believed to be impractical to implement and it was believed to be too late in the project to implement the system.

**(h) Financial Planning/Co-financing**

Co financing (Type/Source)	GEF grant (mill US\$)		Government (mill US\$)		Other* (mill US\$)		Total (mill US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants	5.00	4.69	0.55	0.55	2.60	0	8.15	5.25
Loans / Concessional								
Credits								
Equity investments								
In-kind support								
Other (*)								
Total								

