

GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF)
UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (UNDP)

TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF MNAZI BAY- RUVUMA ESTUARY MARINE PARK PROJECT (MBREMP)

Project No. 00015405 (formerly URT/00G31/B/1G/99)

Philip Tortell and Benjamin Ngatunga, *Consultants*

Dar es Salaam and Wellington, December 2007

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to acknowledge the tremendous assistance we received from many individuals and organizations in carrying out this evaluation.

Firstly, we would like to thank the staff of the Project Management Unit, especially the National Project Manager/Coordinator (and Marine Park Warden-in-Charge) Mr Milali Ernest Machumu and the Technical Advisor Mr David Reynolds, who received us warmly, shared their experience of the project with us and provided us with all the documents and other information we requested. The Unit was also most helpful by arranging the schedule of appointments in Mnazi Bay/ Mtwara and assisting with logistics. Marine Park personnel accompanied us to meetings and always responded right away to the incessant questions and other requests which we made. The insights provided by all those involved in the implementation of the MBREMP Project were invaluable. Their warmth and hospitality were greatly appreciated.

We also would like to extend our thanks to officials from the Marine Parks and Reserves Management Unit, as well as officials from various other central and local government organizations, who described their relationship with the project and shared their views and experiences of the Project and its various activities with us in a transparent manner.

A number of NGOs with offices in Dar es Salaam and in Mtwara, have been associated with the project in different ways ranging from serving as implementation agency (IUCN) to collaborating on follow-up activities (e.g. WWF). To them and to other non-governmental organizations, we wish to express our gratitude for their meeting with us, describing their relationship with the project, sharing their views and advising us of their plans and possibilities for collaboration.

We would also like to thank the UNDP Environment Team, led by Gertrude Lyatuu, and the past UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Coordinator Alan Rodgers, for inducting us into and updating us on the intricacies of the project, especially some of its difficult times, providing us with background documentation and briefings and helping us with logistics.

Finally our sincere thanks to the French Government and FFEM, the major co-financier of the project, for the open and transparent manner in which they shared their views of the project with us.

To all the above as well as to those who provided us with written comments on the draft report, we are sincerely grateful.



Philip Tortell

Consultant

Environmental Management Limited

P O Box 27 433, Wellington, NEW ZEALAND

Tel +64-4-384 4133, Fax +64-4-384 4022, Email <tortell@attglobal.net>



Benjamin Ngatunga

Director of Research

Tanzania Fisheries Research Institute

P.O Box 9750, Dar es Salaam, TANZANIA

Tel: +255-22-265 0043/45 (Office) or 074-836 9755 (Mobile), Fax: +255-22-265 0043

Email: <bpngatunga@yahoo.co.uk>

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | 2 |
| ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS | 5 |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 6 |
| 1 INTRODUCTION | 10 |
| 1.1 Background | 10 |
| 1.2 The Project | 11 |
| 1.3 The Evaluation | 12 |
| 1.3.1 Evaluation objectives and Terms of Reference | 12 |
| 1.3.2 Mission activities | 13 |
| 1.4 Methodology of the evaluation | 13 |
| 1.4.1 The approach adopted | 13 |
| 1.4.2 Documents reviewed and consulted | 14 |
| 1.4.3 Consultations with key stakeholders and government officials | 14 |
| 1.4.4 Structure of this report | 14 |
| 2 FINDINGS: PROJECT DESIGN, REVIEWS AND REVISION | 15 |
| 2.1 Project formulation and design | 15 |
| 2.1.1 The project document and basic design | 15 |
| 2.1.2 Identified risks | 15 |
| 2.2 The Mid-Term Review | 16 |
| 2.2.1 Conclusions of the MTE | 16 |
| 2.2.2 Management response | 17 |
| 3 FINDINGS: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT | 17 |
| 3.1 Project governance | 17 |
| 3.1.1 The project implementation framework | 17 |
| 3.1.2 The Project Steering Committee | 18 |
| 3.1.3 The Project Management Unit | 20 |
| 3.1.4 The role of Government | 21 |
| 3.1.5 The role of IUCN | 22 |
| 3.1.6 The role of UNDP | 23 |
| 3.2 Financial management | 24 |
| 3.2.1 Overall observations | 24 |
| 3.2.2 Financial planning | 25 |
| 3.2.3 The disbursement process | 26 |
| 3.2.4 Co-financing | 28 |
| 3.3 Stakeholder participation | 29 |
| 3.3.1 The Mtwara Declaration | 29 |
| 3.3.2 Participation at the project formulation phase | 29 |
| 3.3.3 Participation during the implementation phase | 30 |
| 3.3.4 The case of Nalingu Village | 31 |
| 3.4 Monitoring and evaluation | 32 |
| 3.4.1 Project performance monitoring and adaptive management | 32 |
| 3.4.2 The Logical Framework Matrix | 33 |
| 3.4.3 Compliance monitoring | 33 |
| 3.4.4 Ecosystem monitoring | 34 |
| 3.4.5 Overall conclusion on monitoring the management effectiveness | 43 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 4 | FINDINGS: RESULTS AND IMPACTS | 43 |
| 4.1 | Results achieved | 43 |
| 4.1.1 | The Development Objective | 43 |
| 4.1.2 | Immediate Objectives/Outcomes/Results | 45 |
| 4.2 | Project impacts | 49 |
| 4.2.1 | Global environmental impacts | 49 |
| 4.2.2 | National level impacts | 50 |
| 5 | FINDINGS: SUSTAINABILITY | 50 |
| 5.1 | Institutional sustainability | 51 |
| 5.2 | Financial sustainability | 51 |
| 5.3 | Knowledge management | 52 |
| 5.4 | Exit strategy | 52 |
| 5.5 | Replicability | 53 |
| 5.6 | Follow-up | 53 |
| 6 | CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 55 |
| 6.1 | Project concept and design | 55 |
| 6.2 | Project governance | 55 |
| 6.3 | Project management | 55 |
| 6.4 | Achievement of targeted outputs and objectives | 55 |
| 6.5 | Project monitoring and evaluation | 56 |
| 6.6 | Financial management | 57 |
| 6.7 | Stakeholder participation, community empowerment | 57 |
| 6.8 | Capacity building and other Project impacts | 57 |
| 6.9 | Sustainability | 58 |
| 6.10 | Knowledge management | 58 |
| 6.11 | Exit strategy | 58 |
| 6.12 | Replicability | 58 |
| 6.13 | Follow-up | 59 |
| 6.14 | Experience gained and lessons learnt | 59 |

ANNEXES

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | Evaluation Terms of Reference |
| 2 | Assignment Schedule |
| 3 | Documents reviewed |
| 4 | Persons consulted |
| 5 | Management response to MTE Recommendations |
| 6 | Mtwara Declaration |
| 7 | Main technical reports and documents produced by MBREMP |
| 8 | Proposals for extension |

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|-----------|---|
| AIG | Alternative Income Generation |
| APR | Annual Project Report |
| AWP | Annual Work Plan |
| BoT | Board of Trustees |
| CBD | Convention on Biological Resources |
| CDM | Clean Development Mechanism |
| CER | Carbon dioxide Emission Reductions |
| CZ | Core Zone (for Marine Park zoning) |
| EIA | Environmental Impact Assessment |
| FFEM | Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| GIS | Geographic Information System |
| GMP | General Management Plans |
| GBRMPA | Great Barrier Reef Marine Protected Area |
| ICAM/ICM | Integrated Coastal Area Management / Integrated Coastal Management |
| ICZM | Integrated Coastal Zone Management |
| IMS | Institute of Marine Sciences (Zanzibar) |
| IUCN-EARO | International Union for the Conservation of Nature – Eastern Africa Regional Office |
| LogFrame | Logical Framework Matrix |
| MACEMP | Marine and Coastal Environment and Management Programme |
| MBREMP | Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park |
| METT | Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool |
| M & E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MNRT | Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism |
| MOMS | Management Oriented Monitoring System |
| MP | Marine Park |
| MPA | Marine Protected Area |
| MPRU | Marine Parks and Reserves Unit |
| MTE | Mid-Term Evaluation |
| NEX | National Execution (of UNDP projects) |
| NGOs | Non Governmental Organizations |
| NPC | National Project Coordinator |
| PA | Protected Area |
| PDF | Project Development Funds |
| PSC | Project Steering Committee |
| PIR | Project Implementation Report (for GEF) |
| PMU | Project Management Unit |
| PRIF | Pre-Investment Fund |
| ProDoc | Project Document |
| STAP | Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (of the GEF) |
| SUZ | Specific Use Zone |
| TA | Technical Advisor |
| TCMP | Tanzania Coastal Management Partnership |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |
| TPDC | Tanzania Petroleum Development Corporation |
| TPR | Tri-Partite Review |
| UNDP-CO | United Nations Development Programme - Country Office |
| UNEP | United Nations Environmental Program |
| VEMP | Village Environment Management Plan |
| VHF | Very High Frequency |
| VLC | Village Liaison Committee |
| WCPA | World Commission for Protected Areas |
| WWF | World Wildlife Fund |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is the independent Terminal Evaluation of the project of the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania, supported by UNDP/GEF and the FFEM, for the Development of the Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park (MBREMP), carried out in November/December 2007.

The project was designed as a 54-month (two phased) project, the ProDoc was approved in March 2002, and activities started in July 2002. A Mid-Term Evaluation was conducted towards the end of 2004 and the Second Phase commenced on 01 February 2005. The project will terminate early in 2008 if no further financial support can be obtained.

The focus of this project was the establishment of Tanzania's second Marine Park at the globally significant locality of Mnazi Bay and the Ruvuma Estuary near the border with Mozambique. The main source of funding support was the Global Environment Facility (GEF) with co-financing support from the FFEM, IUCN, communities and UNDP. Government funding in the form of staff salaries, operational expenses and some community work was also substantial.

The Project development objective was to: *Enable local and government stakeholders to protect effectively and utilize sustainably the marine biodiversity and resources of Mnazi Bay and the Ruvuma Estuary*, and the project came within the GEF Operational Programme No.2: Coastal Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems. It promoted the conservation and sustainable use of the globally important biological diversity of Tanzania's coastal, marine and island ecosystems.

This Terminal Evaluation is to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of project performance by assessing its project design, process of implementation and results vis-à-vis the project objectives endorsed by the GEF.

The Evaluation Team based their approach on the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation and were guided by the ToRs and consultations with UNDP Tanzania. The approach adopted was a participatory one and opinions and information, following a thorough desk review of relevant documents and websites, were obtained through consultations with UNDP Tanzania, FFEM, IUCN, Central and Local Government, the Project Management Unit, villagers, other stakeholders and partners. The consultation process which started in Dar es Salaam, culminated in visits to the project office in Mtwara and discussions with project personnel, local government officials, community members and other stakeholders and beneficiaries at the project site.

The project concept was found to be basically sound and the project design was also fine in principle. The approach inherent in the project design is an effective means for achieving the objectives. In particular, the emphasis on community activities, ranging from awareness-raising to alternative income generating activities, is seen as a very sound approach. However, the implementation arrangements were somewhat unwieldy and the division into two phases with responsibilities entrusted to a different organization for each phase was a design fault.

Project management was generally effective in both phases but suffered through the hiatus created between the two phases. In addition, there seems to have been two “managers” with overlapping responsibilities and unclear roles during the First Phase and this did affect project delivery. The unclear distinction between the roles of PM and TA are a recurring problem in UN projects and we recommend against this sort of model in future.

The project did not have an M&E Plan however, the extent of monitoring undertaken by the project satisfies the requirements of UNDP and GEF and the Team feels that monitoring activities by the project can be rated as **satisfactory** overall. The Team considers the quality of the LogFrame and its use as a tool for project management to have been **moderately satisfactory**. The Team found compliance monitoring to be **moderately satisfactory** while the involvement of communities in

monitoring activities is deemed to have been **satisfactory**. The rating for ecosystem monitoring is **moderately satisfactory** because it is still being developed and this recognizes its future potential.

The Team could not rate progress towards the Development Objective by looking at the Indicators as they do not match the Objective. However, we are aware of the work that has been achieved by the PMU and we consider it to be **satisfactory**.

Progress towards Outcome 1 (Knowledge base) has been **satisfactory** with an adequate technical base established for Park management. More work is required especially on the social dimension.

Progress towards Outcome 2 (Awareness) has been **marginally satisfactory** and more work is required and not only in Nalingu Village.

Progress towards Outcome 3 (Planning and Monitoring) has been **satisfactory** in terms of both planning and monitoring even though the latter requires some more work.

Progress towards Outcome 4 ((Management Plan) is considered **marginally satisfactory** even though the Plan has been prepared. This rating is the result of the Indicators selected and the extent of project progress towards them.

Progress towards Outcome 5 (Capacity) has been **satisfactory**. On the basis of the Indicators, this Outcome should be rated as unsatisfactory, however, our understanding of the real situation leads us to assign the satisfactory rating.

Progress towards Outcome 6 (Alternative Incomes) is considered **marginally satisfactory** and more work is required particularly at the commercial end of the operations.

Only Outcome 1 has a set of relevant and useful Indicators – the rest range from inappropriate to inadequate to unnecessary. The Team believes that most Indicators were not very helpful to the PMU and recommends greater attention to Indicators in future project planning

The project has carried out virtually all the planned activities and made significant progress towards all the targeted Outcomes. It needs to be recognized that as a result of the type of project – the Marine Park exists, and will continue – many of the activities are “open-ended”. It is therefore more appropriate to measure progress by the distance from the baseline rather than the distance towards an objective.

On this basis, the Team believes that the progress attained by the project has been significant and **satisfactory over all**.

The involvement of too many layers made financial management somewhat complex during Phase One. However, in both phases, finances were adequately managed, there was no obvious waste and no extravagance, and value for money has been achieved. The Evaluation Team notes that many problems encountered during the First Phase did not occur during the Second Phase when the disbursement was made directly by UNDP to the Marine Park Unit / Project Management Unit, through the MPRU, according to the NEX modality. In contracting an international organization to serve as implementing agency for a project, thus introducing an additional administrative layer, the Government and UNDP need to balance these risks with the benefits that such an arrangement is expected to bring to the project

The team traced the direct co-financing to the extent possible and was able to ascertain that the greater part of the funds had been raised. Out of the funds that had been raised through co-financing, the project was able to use only US\$645,800, and US\$200,000 may be reabsorbed.

Institutional sustainability is “guaranteed” by the Government’s ownership of the project product, namely the Marine Park, and the Evaluation Team is confident in rating the institutional sustainability

of MBREMP as **very likely**. On the other hand, financial sustainability is not yet secure, even though prospects are very good. There is a need for a Financial Sustainability Strategy for the Park to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends. And in view of the work that still needs to be done towards financial sustainability, the Team rates financial sustainability as **moderately likely**.

This is an operational Marine Park, and the work started by the project is on-going and open-ended. The prospects are very good for the Park to become self-sustaining in the not too distant future, but until this eventuality, there is a need for further support to consolidate the investments made by the project in communities' engagement, to refine the monitoring strategy and to develop the financial sustainability strategy.

The Evaluation Team recommends to FFEM to consider such an extension to the project delivery time at no extra cost. We also recommend to UNDP that it provides support and advice to the Government for the identification of further financial support. Finally, the Evaluation Team recommends to the Marine Park that in any extension/follow-up period, the focus should be on:

- Community engagement (various activities ranging from AIGs to the gear exchange programme, Honorary Wardens System and other forms of meaningful participation)
- Refinement of the Monitoring Strategy allowing for different types of monitoring with different objectives and addressing the management of data and information that arise from the monitoring activity as well as the actions that will be precipitated by the emerging results and trends
- Development and implementation of a Financial Sustainability Strategy including identification of potential sources of funding and the development of mechanisms through which these sources can be utilized.

The project has genuinely strived to provide avenues for **community participation**, however, its efforts did not always create the envisaged results, at least not in the early stages of the project. The lesson from this is that it takes time, maybe a long time, to encourage and convince people to change the way of life that they have practiced for generations – projects that rely on the good will and collaboration of communities need to allow adequate time for confidence to be built and credibility to be established before they can expect results.

In an effort to build capacity and then enhance that capacity through operational responsibility, the project was designed in **two Phases** and entrusted to two different actors. In hindsight this was not a good model and the project suffered because of the problems of transition. The lesson is that before such a model is applied again, the project proponents need to weigh and balance the benefits of such an approach, with the risks which appear inevitable.

Alternative Income Generation activities are a recognized way of easing the pressure on natural resources without penalizing communities that have depended on them. But in order to maintain credibility in the eyes of the communities, these activities must be successful. The lesson is that all AIGs must be worked through thoroughly and before they are applied, because no AIG is a lesser evil than a failed AIG.

The Park is going to depend on sustainable financial support sources for its continued effective operation and the **Sustainable Financing Strategy** is still being developed and negotiations are still ongoing, a few weeks from project closure, with the risk that time will run out before a robust strategy has been developed. The lesson is that such an essential element for sustainability must be finalized early in the project life so that it can be tried out, refined and adopted well before the Park becomes reliant on it.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Continental Tanzania has a coastline of 800km (1,420km when all islands are taken into account) and a rich diversity of tropical marine and coastal systems including coral reefs, sea-grass beds, mangrove stands and sand dunes. These marine and coastal resources are critical to Tanzania's economic and social development and underpin the livelihoods of coastal communities who rely heavily on the sea for their food and income. According to the Environmental Assessment Report (Annex 9, ProDoc), Tanzania's coastal and marine biodiversity is also important globally.

Rural and urban development is placing pressure on these resources and this threat is expected to increase as coastal populations expand. The conservation and sustainable development of the marine environment in Tanzania is an issue of pressing national, as well as global, concern.

The Government has recognized the value of its coastal environments and resources and the current and potential threats that they face. In response, it has enacted various legislation of which the *Marine Parks and Reserves Act (1994)* is the most relevant to this project. Procedures governing the establishment and management of Marine Parks have been refined through the experience gained in developing the Mafia Island Marine Park which was the first one to be declared¹. The Act establishes the Marine Parks and Reserves Unit which reports to the Board of Trustees for Marine Parks and Reserves which in turn is answerable to the Minister for Natural Resources and Tourism. The Board has its own financial arrangements with revenue collected from Marine Parks kept separate from the central Government's general revenue.

The second Marine Park to be established in Tanzania was at Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary which had been identified as a global priority site for the conservation of marine biological diversity (UNEP, 1989; Muhando et al, 1998; GBRMPA/World Bank/IUCN, 1995)². Coastal resources of greatest importance in Mnazi Bay and Ruvuma Estuary include mangrove and associated fauna and flora, seagrass beds and organisms therein, coral reef fish and other coral reef inhabitants, seaweed, and other rare but ecologically or economically significant organisms such as turtles, dolphins, seahorse, whales, sharks and coelacanths. The establishment of a marine protected area was recognized as the optimum management strategy for the protection of the area's critical biodiversity values while also attaining sustainable utilization of the marine resources.

The emphasis on community involvement and ownership satisfies the principles of the Act. It also reflects the situation on the ground - Mtwara District is amongst the poorest in Tanzania and 11 villages (together with some sub-villages) are situated within the borders of the Marine Park with a total population of about 30,000 people. These communities are disadvantaged, relying primarily on subsistence fishing and agriculture for their survival. The ProDoc gave the per capita incomes as less than US\$100 per annum at the time of project formulation. In addition, the infrastructure in the Mtwara District is poorly developed in comparison to the rest of Tanzania and this is especially so in the villages bordering Mnazi Bay. In these villages there is no mains electricity supply and fuel is scarce; there are limited telephone, radio or television communications; water supplies are unreliable; health, education and many other basic services are 20-40 km away (in Mtwara) by way of a poor-quality unsealed road that can be impassable in the wet season. Poverty is a real barrier to the establishment of protected areas since the local residents often have no choice but to rely on their environment and natural resources for their survival.

¹ Tanzania's first Marine Park, Mafia Island, was established in 1995 with support from WWF and NORAD. Note that in Tanzania, the Marine Parks can have a core "no-use zone" and a variety of "sustainable-use zones", which can include habitation. This differs from Tanzania's terrestrial parks.

² As quoted, without reference, in the ProDoc, Annex 9 - Mnazi Bay Marine Park Project: Environmental Assessment Report. Based on a report by C. Muhando *et al*, Institute of Marine Sciences. Zanzibar.

1.2 The project

The focus of this project was the establishment of Tanzania's second Marine Park at the globally significant locality of Mnazi Bay and the Ruvuma Estuary near the border with Mozambique. The main source of funding support according to the ProDoc was the Global Environment Facility (GEF) with co-financing support from the Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial (FFEM), IUCN, communities and UNDP. Government funding in the form of staff salaries, operational expenses and some community work was also substantial.

The project was designed as a 54-month (two phased) project, including an initial participatory planning phase (24 months) followed by an implementation phase (30 months). The UNDP/GEF project document was approved in March 2002, and activities started in July 2002 when the first disbursement was made. A Mid-Term Evaluation was conducted towards the end of 2004 to enable all parties to assess progress and agree on specific administrative and implementation responsibilities for the Second Phase. According to correspondence between UNDP and IUCN-EARO, the Second Phase commenced on 01 February 2005. The project will terminate early in 2008 if no further financial support can be obtained.

The Marine Parks and Reserves Unit (MPRU) of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism was designated as Executing Agency on behalf of the Government. Day-to-day implementation in the First Phase was contracted by the Government to the East Africa Regional Office (EARO) of IUCN, while the Second Phase was implemented directly by Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park personnel under the supervision of the Marine Parks and Reserves Management Unit.

The Goal of the Project was to: *Conserve a representative example of internationally significant and threatened marine biodiversity*

The Project development objective was to: *Enable local and government stakeholders to protect effectively and utilize sustainably the marine biodiversity and resources of Mnazi Bay and the Ruvuma Estuary*

To achieve the above objectives, project design identified the following seven broad Outcomes:

1. A knowledge base to support marine environmental planning and sustainable development established
2. Local communities and key decision makers are aware of marine problems, benefits and responsibilities of an MPA and use information in decision making
3. Marine Park planning and monitoring processes established, and an initial marine park management plan developed
4. Park general Management Plan under implementation with externalities addressed (phase two only)
5. Improved capacity of key stakeholders and institutions for marine conservation and management
6. Alternative Income Generation (AIG) and sustainable use regime activities are researched, developed, piloted and adopted
7. Project effectively managed, monitored and evaluated

This biodiversity project fell within the GEF Operational Programme No.2: Coastal Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems. It promoted the conservation and sustainable use of the globally important biological diversity of Tanzania's coastal, marine and island ecosystems. The project remains relevant today in spite of the new Strategic Priorities of GEF-4 for Biodiversity (Strategic Objective 1 on Protected Areas and Strategic Objective 2 Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Productive Sectors).

1.3 The Evaluation

1.3.1 Evaluation objectives and Terms of Reference

This is the independent Terminal Evaluation of the project of the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania, supported by UNDP/GEF, on the Development of Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park, carried out in November/December 2007.

According to the ToRs (see Annex 1), the Terminal Evaluation must provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the completed project by assessing its project design, process of implementation and results vis-à-vis the project objectives endorsed by the GEF (including any changes agreed to in the course of project implementation).

There are four complementary purposes for the evaluation as follows:

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

Specifically, the Terminal Evaluation will carry out the following tasks:

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

outcomes/benefits after completion of GEF/FFEM funding, considering the “traditional” economic activities in which these communities are involved

- Identify and document the main successes, challenges and lessons that have emerged. In describing lessons learned, make a distinction between those lessons applicable only to this project, and lessons that may be of value more broadly, including to other similar projects in the UNDP/GEF pipeline portfolio

1.3.2 Mission activities

Work on this evaluation commenced in mid-November 2007 from homebase with assignment planning, preparation of the schedule of work, interpretation of the Terms of Reference, documents review and websites searches. Sunday 25 and Monday 26 November were spent by the International Consultant travelling to Tanzania and he arrived in Dar es Salaam in the evening of Monday 26 November. Tuesday 27 November saw the beginning of a series of briefing and consultative meetings with Government agencies, UNDP, relevant NGOs and other key stakeholders following the assembly of the Team. On Friday 30 November the Evaluation Team travelled to Mtwara where the project is based.

The Team was in Mtwara from Friday 30 November until Saturday 08 December when they travelled back to Dar es Salaam. The time in Mtwara was devoted to an extensive programme of consultations with project personnel, stakeholders, beneficiaries and others.

On returning to Dar es Salaam, the Team prepared for a presentation of preliminary findings which was made to the PSC and other stakeholders on Monday 10 December. Following this, the Evaluation Team provided a final draft of the Evaluation Report to the UNDP on Thursday 13 December, and the International Consultant departed Dar es Salaam that evening. Following a brief period for comments on the draft, the Evaluation Report was finalized and dispatched in the final week of December 2007.

The full Schedule for this assignment is in Annex 2.

1.4 Methodology of the evaluation

1.4.1 The approach adopted

Overall guidance on terminal evaluation methodologies is provided by the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation³. The Evaluation Team based their approach on this guiding document together with the ToRs, and in consultation with UNDP Tanzania.

This has been a participatory evaluation (as required by the ToRs) and opinions and information were obtained through the following activities:

- Desk review of relevant documents and websites
- Discussions with UNDP Tanzania senior management
- Consultation meetings with Central and Local Government and other stakeholders and partners
- Visit to the project office in Mtwara and discussions with project personnel, as well as with government officials, community members and other stakeholders and beneficiaries

According to the Handbook⁴, *“Project evaluations assess the efficiency and effectiveness of a project in achieving its intended results. They also assess the relevance and sustainability of outputs as contributions to medium-term and longer-term outcomes. Project evaluation can be invaluable for managing for results, and serves to reinforce the accountability of project managers. Additionally,*

³ *Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results* (2002) United Nations Development Programme Evaluation Office

⁴ *Op. cit.*

project evaluation provides a basis for the evaluation of outcomes and programmes, as well as for strategic and programmatic evaluations and APRs, and for distilling lessons from experience for learning and sharing knowledge. In UNDP, project evaluations are mandatory when required by a partnership protocol, such as with the Global Environment Facility". As a result, all full and medium-size projects supported by the GEF undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation.

As there has been a Mid-Term Evaluation⁵ for the project, this Terminal Evaluation has focused particularly (although not exclusively) on the period following the MTE, *i.e.* post 2004.

1.4.2 Documents reviewed and consulted

The Evaluation Team was provided with an initial list of documents by UNDP and the Project Team. Additional documentation was sought by the Team to provide the background to the project, insights into project implementation and management, a record of project outputs, etc. The list of salient documents reviewed and/or consulted by the Team is in Annex 3 which also contains a reference to websites which were visited and reviewed.

1.4.3 Consultations with key stakeholders and government officials

Consultations by the Evaluation Team took place in both Dar es Salaam and Mtwara as well as in the Marine Park territory.

The Team met with 162 individuals in all and many were consulted on a one to one basis. These came from a wide spectrum of sectors associated with the project – from within UNDP, Central Government organizations, Regional and District authorities, project personnel and the MPRU and Trust Board, other stakeholders particularly members of the various steering committees, NGOs, the private sector and project beneficiaries and community organizations. Most meetings followed the same pattern, namely, a brief introduction on the purpose of the mission followed by an identification of the relationship that the consultee had with the Project, if any, and his/her views on the Project.

The Team also made contact with IUCN-EARO and consulted electronically, as well as with FFEM through a telephone conversation.

The initial list of consultees was proposed by UNDP and MPRU in Dar es Salaam and the Project Implementation Unit in Mtwara. This was supplemented through the Team's initiative.

A full list of organizations and persons met and consulted by the Team is to be found in Annex 4.

It is also worth noting that there were 7 written submissions of comments on the draft Report. These comments were consolidated and taken into account fully when this final Report was being prepared. Acknowledgement was provided to all those who made written comments.

1.4.4 Structure of this report

The Evaluation Team analyzed the information obtained and presented a draft for discussion and feedback. Following this, this Report was finalized with the benefit of the input received.

This Report is intended primarily for UNDP CO in Tanzania and the GEF. It is structured in three main parts. Following the Executive Summary, the first part of the Report comprises an Introduction

⁵ Gawler, Meg and Christopher Muhando (2004) *UNDP-GEF Project 00015405 - URT/00G31/B/1G/99 - Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park - Mid-term Evaluation*

which also covers the methodology of the evaluation and the development context of the project. The next part covers the Findings and is made up of a number of discrete but closely linked sections following the scope proposed for project evaluation reports by the UNDP Guidelines. The final part comprises the Conclusions and Recommendations. A number of annexes provide additional, relevant information.

2 FINDINGS: PROJECT DESIGN, REVIEWS AND REVISION

2.1 Project formulation and design

2.1.1 The Project Document and basic design

The ProDoc follows the standard format and scope current at the time of project formulation. All essential elements are present. However, the version available to the Evaluation Team lacked “quality control”. For example, the Table of Contents has no page numbers; the wording of the Objectives could be tightened to provide better vision (although the STAP Review observed that the Objectives are simple and direct); loose terminology (Objectives, Outcomes, and Components are used interchangeably) creates confusion; and, the Section “Project Activities and Expected Results” does not discuss activities or results – it discusses phasing.

The project structure is logical even if not entirely clear. There is a Project Goal and a Development Objective. Then there are four Components or Immediate Objectives covering participatory planning and management, the development of sustainable livelihoods, capacity building, and monitoring and evaluation. These are followed by a sequence of four Objectives, each with its list of expected Results. Unfortunately the wording is not consistent and neither is the order in which they are presented. These elements are discussed in more detail in respective sections below.

The Evaluation Team believes that the approach inherent in the project design is an effective means of achieving the objectives. In particular, the emphasis on community activities, ranging from awareness-raising to alternative income generating activities, is seen as a very sound approach. However, there is always room for improvement and this is discussed further in this report.

The Team considers the complex implementation arrangements, especially the disruptive changes between the First and the Second Phases, as a weakness in the project design and this is discussed further below. The Team also agrees with the MTE that a further problem with the project design was the ambitious nature of the plan and the over-optimistic timetable for execution.

2.1.2 Identified risks

The ProDoc identified four main areas of risk and these are listed in the table below together with the response that the project was expected to apply to minimize each risk. The table also shows the Evaluation Team’s comments.

As can be seen from the above table, the risks all related directly or indirectly, to community acceptance / cooperation / ownership issues and the Team feels that in general the risks remain as a threat to the product of the project, namely the Park. The Team recommends that attention continue to be paid to community perspectives as a priority activity of the exit strategy. In fact, it will not be possible to address this problem adequately within the timeframe of the exit strategy and the Park will need to address it in any follow-up activities.

Table 1. Addressing identified risks

| RISK AS IDENTIFIED IN THE PRODOC | RESPONSE PROPOSED TO MINIMIZE RISK | EVALUATION TEAM COMMENTS |
|--|--|---|
| <i>Stakeholder support for and participation in management activities may decline after Project completion</i> | This eventuality is addressed through the Project's strong emphasis on community needs and active participation. The Project aims to achieve a real sense of ownership that will continue beyond its duration. The emphasis is on developing AIG activities that replace unsustainable practices and clearly link biodiversity outcomes with economic and social gains | The Team notes that the project has enabled the Marine Park to engage communities successfully even though it has not been entirely successful in getting communities to "buy in" into the project. If the external funding support to the Park is curtailed at this stage, this risk may well materialize. |
| <i>Co-operative arrangements between communities and the Marine Parks and Reserves Unit may break down</i> | Communities are represented on the Marine Parks Advisory Committee and the Project Steering Committee to mitigate this risk. The Project defines specific benchmarks to be achieved prior to funding for implementation, including demonstration that communities and authorities will work together effectively | The cooperation of communities is not entirely secure and there is a need for more than representation on committees and AIGs. This risk remains and without funds for more gear exchange, more awareness, and more involvement, cooperation could weaken. |
| <i>Co-operative arrangements between the relevant government authorities may break down</i> | This risk is addressed by the involvement of a senior political decision-maker (local member of Parliament) as a member of the Board, and by the representation of key District leadership and agencies on the Advisory Committee | This risk will remain beyond the life of the project and the Team observed that the situation is already quite politicized. |
| <i>There may be inadequate revenue to meet ongoing management costs</i> | This risk is addressed through the commitment of the Board to meet ongoing costs. The Project minimises the costs of management and will undertake regular review of the success of the Sustainable Financing Strategy. There is a formal review of project sustainability to be undertaken in the final year to assess the success of the AIG projects and consider how these might be improved as required | The response mixes two very distinct issues – sustainability of the Marine Park administration and management; and sustainability of the AIG activities. The Team believes that financial sustainability of the Park is not secure yet and this is discussed in Section 5 in this report. As noted above, the sustainability of AIG activities is also uncertain and is addressed under Sections 4.1.2 and 6.7 |

2.2 The Mid-Term Review

Having started this evaluation at the beginning with the ProDoc, the Evaluation Team wanted to skip the First Phase of the project since this had been the focus of a Mid-Term Evaluation. Project management was therefore invited by the Evaluation Team to provide a response to the MTE and the full tabulated response is found in Annex 5 which also carries the observations of this Team. Following is a synopsis of the MTE and of the response from management.

2.2.1 Conclusions of the MTE

The MTE was carried out towards the end of 2004 when the project had been running for over two years and the First Phase was coming to an end. The main findings of the MTE were the following:

- *A good team is presently in place (although a new Technical Advisor is needed urgently)*
- *The project has had good success in establishing the knowledge base*
- *There is a strong sense of ownership by Tanzanian government*
- *The project and the park are in imminent danger of losing the goodwill in the villages*
- *There have been serious implementation problems, including far too much interference from project partners in implementation*
- *Delays in the availability of funding and excessive control have resulted in costly delays.*

The MTE also made three strategic recommendations and 99 specific recommendations. The strategic recommendations were:

- *It is urgent to move quickly with concrete benefits to local people*

- *All project partners should take a giant step back, and delegate responsibility more fully to the project team to implement the project*
- *MPRU should assume operational responsibility for the Implementation Phase of the project, and be held accountable for project deliverables.*

The Evaluation Team believes that these three key recommendations of the MTE have been acted upon with good results.

The MTE further noted that a good number of important building blocks had been put in place in the process leading up to the project and in the First Phase. However, some strategic errors, as well as a number of implementation problems had tended to undermine the foundation which was thought to be somewhat fragile.

Finally, the MTE concluded that:

- *This is fundamentally a very worthwhile project.*
- *A solid framework for the marine park is being established.*
- *There is tremendous good will among most community members. However, this is fragile, and risks being lost if concrete benefits are not realized quickly.*
- *A number of corrective measures need to be taken in the second phase if the project is to succeed.*
- *The MBREMP team shows great promise of making a success of the park, if given the support that is needed.*

2.2.2 Management response

Project management accepted and implemented the three strategic recommendations and it has benefited as a result. And, as can be seen in the table in Annex 5, the PMU advised the Team that out of the 99 recommendations advanced by the MTE only seven were not accepted by project management while one was partially accepted. However, as a result of time constraints very few recommendations were fully implemented but the PMU did not think that the project has suffered because of the fact that some recommendations were not accepted or only partially implemented.

This Team observes that following the MTE and in spite of its recommendations, the handover between the two Phases still took a long time and there have been no significant revisions or refinements to the project LogFrame.

3 FINDINGS: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT

3.1 Project governance

3.1.1 The project implementation framework

UNDP and the Government agreed that the project will be executed under the NEX (national execution) modality which is the norm for UNDP projects. The UNDP Programming Manual⁶ states that “NEX is used when there is adequate capacity in government to undertake the functions and activities of the programme or project. The UNDP country office ascertains the national capacities during the formulation stage.” In this case, it was recognized that at the initial stages of

⁶ UNDP Programming Manual. UNDP, New York, 2000

implementation, capacity would be weak but this was to be addressed through the project being designed in two phases with First Phase implementation entrusted to a well-known international organization and the Second Phase to be implemented by the Government, subject to a Mid-Term Evaluation.

Execution responsibility for this GEF project was thus vested in the Government, through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. The Marine Parks and Reserves Unit, in the Fisheries Division of the Ministry, is the lead agency dealing with marine parks in Tanzania and as such was spearheading the execution of the project by Government. However, it was the Ministry that was responsible to UNDP for ensuring adequate progress of this project.

As noted repeatedly elsewhere, the project was designed to be implemented in two phases, and this is not unusual. However, what created difficulties was the decision to have a different implementing agency for each phase, even though this was for good reason. During the Set-Up Phase (Phase One), implementation was contracted to an international organization, IUCN-EARO. The Government, as Executing Agency, entered into an agreement with IUCN-EARO and the latter, as implementing agency, reported to both UNDP and Government. By the Implementation Phase (Phase Two), the Marine Park Unit had developed adequate operational capacity and assumed the responsibility for implementation. The details of the changeover were developed during the Mid-Term Evaluation but the changeover was fraught with difficulties and delays for various reasons, but primarily because the Government and IUCN-EARO could not agree on the role of the latter during the Second Phase. Staff turnover at IUCN-EARO did not help, either – those who were involved in the project design did not implement and those who implemented had left IUCN at the time of this evaluation.

There were long and protracted negotiations between IUCN-EARO and the Government over the refunding of US\$209,680 which had been pre-financed by IUCN-EARO unilaterally (see section 3.2 below). While activities did not stop altogether, progress during this inter-phase period was very slow. The contentions were not resolved and finally, IUCN was requested by the PSC in September 2006, following a management audit, to formally hand over the project to MPRU. This was carried out in March 2007, two years after Phase One had ended.

IUCN-EARO advised the Team that *“in hindsight, there should have been provision in the ProDoc for an Exit Strategy for IUCN-EARO. This would have provided a method for the effective mainstreaming of MBREMP to MPRU by IUCN and also taken care of the intricacies involved in handing over of roles and responsibilities”*. The reality was somewhat acrimonious and did not do any good to the project.

The Team recommends that when a phased project is designed in future, there should not be a change in implementing agency and, if this is unavoidable, there needs to be a strategy to ensure an orderly hand-over of project management responsibilities.

3.1.2 The Project Steering Committee

The Project Steering Committee (PSC) is the highest level of governance for the project and according to the ProDoc, it was to be established under the auspices of the Marine Parks and Reserves Board of Trustees to oversee the implementation of the project.

The members were to be appointed by the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism and was meant to include all members of the Mnazi Bay - Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Advisory Committee as well as representatives of other Government organizations and collaborating donor agencies. In effect, membership comprised ...

The Regional Administrative Secretary

The District Executive Director

The District Natural Resources Officer
An NGO representative
A representative of the Ministry of Tourism
Two representatives from Village Councils
A representative of a Scientific Institution
Two representatives of Business concerns one from Fisheries and the other from Tourism
Manager of the MPRU (ex-officio)
The Chairman of the Marine Parks and Reserves Board of Trustees
The GEF Focal Point for Tanzania
UNDP Country Office Dar es Salaam
UNDP GEF Coordination Unit
IUCN-EARO
Member of Parliament

The Chairperson was to be the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, or his/her representative. In the event, the PSC size of membership was soon found to be unwieldy and the membership was revised and reduced.

The PSC was meant to meet at least twice a year and by and large, it did this. Its functions, according to the ToRs in the ProDoc Annex 4, were:

1. *To monitor project implementation in terms of effectiveness and timeliness of inputs and in terms of the success of project activities*
2. *To oversee and provide guidance to project activities and ensure such activities address the project objectives*
3. *To provide a forum for ensuring an integrated approach to project activities within Mtwara District*
4. *Provide a forum for, and link to, the National Marine Parks processes*
5. *Approve annual work-plans and budget for the project and consider changes as recommended*
6. *In UNDP terminology: to perform the functions of the Tripartite Review (TPR) to consider and approve Annual Project Reports (APRS)*
7. *To review the TOR of project staff, and amend them as necessary*
8. *To approve the proposed implementing agencies for the project*

The above list comprises a more or less complete set of the tasks normally given to the PSC. Among further tasks that could have been added are the following:

- Mediate and resolve conflicts and problem areas as needed to facilitate project delivery
- Ensure that country commitments, including of co-financing and technical and operational support, are met

However, the Team was advised that the PSC did provide mediation and attempts were made to resolve conflicts.

The Team feels that the PSC was used primarily as a vehicle for inclusion and representation, even when its membership was reduced and better focussed. It also served as an effective coordinating mechanism between national agencies, UNDP and the GEF. While these functions of cooperation, collaboration and information are valuable to the project, it must always be borne in mind that the PSC must also steer the project. As evidenced from the minutes of PSC Meetings, the operational procedures and the business attended to during meetings, appear most relevant to the project and it is felt that the PSC did provide the guidance and steering that it is meant to.

IUCN-EARO concurs that the PSC was an important decision-making organ designed to guide the project and approve annual workplans and that it executed its mandate in a professional manner during Phase One of the project, and it has done so since. IUCN-EARO also found the PSC to be “reasonably useful” in that it provided a formal opportunity for IUCN-EARO to present technical reports of progress and to discuss critical implementation issues. But, IUCN-EARO reported that “the membership of the Committee was not strong in that there were several silent members, and others

who rarely attended meetings. It would have been improved if 1-2 eminent Tanzanians with great interest in MBREMP and the conservation of Tanzania's marine biodiversity were on the Committee. It would also have been improved if a MPRU Board member was on the Committee. Members of the civil society should have been included, and gender balance should be improved".

One matter which the Team sought clarification on was the so-called "Partners Meetings" which allegedly took place prior to each PSC meeting *"to discuss and approve workplans and budgets"*. When asked about the value and usefulness of the PSC, those entrusted with managing the project during the Second Phase said they found it helpful *"but the partners were stronger than the PSC"*. On seeking clarification, the Team was relieved to hear that these partners' meetings did not pre-empt the work and decision-making function of the PSC – they merely discussed issues of common interest as they arose and the decision-making function remained with the PSC. The partners' simply used the opportunity presented by the PSC meeting, to overcome the barrier of distance between Nairobi, Dar es Salaam and Mtwara.

3.1.3 The Project Management Unit⁷

According to FFEM, project management during Phase One, when it was the responsibility of IUCN-EARO, *"went through serious difficulties : lack of coordination between the different parties, lack of consultation between the partners ; over expenditure of more than 60% on some budget lines without consultation of the partners, etc"*. These issues were addressed by the MTE and will not be re-opened by this evaluation.

The Project Management Unit (PMU) function during the Second Phase was provided by the Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park team with the addition of the Technical Advisor. It was led by the Warden-in-Charge of the Park and, in addition to the Warden-in-Charge, it comprised six other staff positions, who, between them cover the following disciplines – community conservation (two positions), sustainable livelihoods, law enforcement and licensing, research and monitoring, and administration and finance. This core group are Park employees and are on the MPRU Government payroll. They, in turn are supported by an extensive complement of support and field staff including rangers, drivers, technical specialists, etc. Staff turnover is reported to have been low and there does not appear to have been any problem retaining staff, in spite of the perceived remoteness of the Mtwara District according to some people. It also should be noted that four Park staff are currently away on study leave pursuing relevant academic qualifications. Of these, one is studying overseas and the other three are in Tanzanian institutions. All four are supported fully by Government and other external funding sources and do not make use of any funding support from the project budget.

The PMU/Park HQ was located in a government offices complex in Mtwara, within driving distance from the Park, except in wet weather when the roads could become impassable. The premises, which were provided to the project as part of the Government contribution, were basic but adequate. Additional facilities were available in the form of basic gatehouses at two road gateways to the Park, one at Msimbati and the other at Kilambo. Plans for the development of a Park HQ in a central position within the Park are very advanced. The project helped fund the drawing up of architectural designs and other preliminary preparations (primarily through FFEM funding) while the construction costs will be covered by a partner project (MACEMP).

Communication between the PMU/Park HQ in Mtwara and the two gatehouses as well as with the patrol boat was by VHF radio and mobile telephone, and the Mtwara office was connected in turn to Dar es Salaam and beyond through telephone and internet/email links.

⁷ Strictly speaking, this project did not have a Project Management Unit. During Phase One project management was provided by IUCN-EARO and during Phase Two the Marine Park Unit in Mtwara has acted as one – it has managed project activities and the project budget, accepted accountability for project funds, received direction from the PSC, reported to the PSC and the GEF through UNDP, etc. In this report, it is referred to as the Project Management Unit since that is the function it is performing.

In his capacity as Warden-in-Chief, the Project Manager⁸ is responsible for all matters concerning Park administration. He is subject to the control of the Board of Trustees and the Park Advisory Committee. The Warden-in-Chief has a responsibility to local communities, district authorities and other stakeholders, and this includes notifying them of planning efforts and ensuring that they have an adequate opportunity to participate in the management of the Park. The position and Terms of Reference of the Project Manager / Warden-in-Chief have not changed between the First and Second Phases of the project.

During the Second Phase, the Technical Advisor is the only project staff not engaged by the Government and who, according to his Terms of Reference, is expected to play an advisory and supportive role to the staff of the Park. His role is to advise and assist the Project Manager in all matters relating to the Project, with a particular focus on marine science and protected area management issues. His main function is to transfer his scientific and technical knowledge and management experience to the Park management staff. The TA reported to the Manager of the MPRU through the Project Manager. Most of the tasks listed in the TA's Terms of Reference are of an advisory or supportive nature.

The cooperative basis on which the Project Manager and the Technical Advisor were observed to operate, was very heartening. However, the relationship was different during the First Phase.

The Terms of Reference for the Technical Advisor during the First Phase, were not too different from those of the present incumbent. However, the title, namely "*IUCN Technical Advisor*" indicated the differences in the position. More substantive was the fact that "*The TA will report administratively to the IUCN Regional Representative based at IUCN-EARO in Nairobi, Kenya and technically, to the Co-ordinator of the Eastern Africa Marine and Coastal Programme*". This position was certainly IUCN's man on the spot – "*the principal focal point responsible for the co-ordination and delivery of the overall IUCN technical assistance programme under the project*" – he was in effect the Project Manager. And, since IUCN had been contracted by the Government to implement the project, it was understandable that it placed its selected candidate in a position of responsibility for the delivery of the project outputs. The problem was not created by the establishment of the position, but by the terminology used to describe the position and the relationship which developed with the National Project Coordinator. In effect, this was not a Technical Advisor position, but a Project Manager's position, and it should have been called so.

The Evaluation Team recommends to UNDP and IUCN, to discontinue the use of the term Technical Advisor when in fact the position is one of Project Manager. The term should be reserved for those who provide technical advice and support, not those expected to manage the project.

3.1.4 The role of Government

This is a project of the Government and as the MTE noted "*there is a strong sense of ownership by the Tanzanian Government*". This was confirmed by this Evaluation Team especially regarding local government level (Regional and District).

According to the ProDoc, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, and more specifically the Board of Trustees for Marine Parks and Reserves, is the Executing Agency under the National Execution (NEX) modality of UNDP. The Board of Trustees for Marine Parks and Reserves wrote formally to UNDP as follows⁹ -

The Board is firmly committed to supporting the ongoing development and management of Marine Parks in Tanzania. Consistent with the requirements of the Act, we can confirm that the Board will:

⁸ The formal designation is "Project Coordinator". However, since from the beginning of the Second Phase he is undoubtedly serving as Project Manager, this is the title that is used in this Evaluation Report.

⁹ Letter from the Manager and Board Secretary of the Board of Trustees for Marine Parks and Reserves in Tanzania, to UNDP, (Reference BT/MPR/D.40/1/20/36), on 29 October 1999, carried as Annex E in the Project Document.

- *Be the national government focal point for implementation of the project.*
- *Ensure coordination with other Ministries, sectors and agencies at the national level, and provide guidance and advice to the project on national policy issues.*
- *Provide in kind assistance through the staff of the Marine Parks and Reserves Unit to ensure the project's conformity with the requirements of the Act in developing and managing the Marine Park.*
- *Appoint and meet the salary and other expenses of the Marine Park staff including the Warden, Enforcement Officer, Socio-economic Officer, Parks Awareness Officer and other supporting staff; and assume full responsibility for meeting all the ongoing costs of managing the Marine Park at the conclusion of the Project.*
- *When the project is approved the Board undertakes to establish a steering mechanism and would invite the GEF Implementing Agency and IUCN to participate in this mechanism.*
- *The Board will assist in arranging such exemptions from taxation and import duties as are normally afforded to development assistance projects in Tanzania.*

The above is a serious commitment of intent by the Government which is seen as having accepted fully its role as owner of the project and as Executing Agency.

However, although the Government retained its ultimate responsibility for project delivery, it contracted IUCN-EARO to undertake day-to-day project implementation and management for the First Phase. Then, when the project came to its full implementation phase (Phase Two), this responsibility reverted to the Marine Parks and Reserves Unit, and through the Unit, to the Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Team on location in Mtwara.

In spite of limited resources, the Government accepted full responsibility for the engagement and salaries of the Marine Park personnel, who have also served as the Project Management Unit and relied on the project for operational expenditure. Now that the UNDP/GEF support is coming to an end, support for these operational expenses is to be sought from other sources. The Evaluation Team accepts this as a current necessity, but looks forward to the time when the Marine Park can either be self-sufficient in terms of operational resources, or receives the required support from the Board and/or the Government – it cannot rely on donors for ever.

3.1.5 The role of IUCN

As evidenced by Annex 6 of the ProDoc, the Marine Parks and Reserves Unit of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism signed a Project Cooperation Agreement with the Eastern Africa Regional Office of the World Conservation Union (IUCN-EARO) on behalf of the Government, to cover Phase One of the project, specifically between 15 February 2001 and 15 July 2003. This arrangement was lauded by the STAP Reviewer who stated – *This is welcomed as they have long experience in the region and have good staff to assist in the planning of the protected area.*

As IUCN-EARO itself stated when asked by the Evaluation Team what they felt they brought to the project: *“IUCN is recognised globally as one of the world’s leading and most established conservation organisations. It is well recognised for being able to provide sound and impartial technical advice, based on a vast network of professionals both regionally and around the world. IUCN is particularly known for its ability to convene and work at various levels, both at high levels within government and at the grass roots level within communities. Its programmatic approach is also guided by its members, ensuring IUCN is responding to conservation needs on the ground. Tanzania has several IUCN members. IUCN’s strengths lie in its scientific base to its conservation work, ensuring conservation approaches are “cutting edge” and based on the latest information. IUCN employs highly qualified, experienced, and internationally renowned Technical Coordinators to lead its thematic programmes, such as the Marine Programme in Eastern Africa, and it is this international reputation and expertise that adds value to those that partner with IUCN. Within the marine parks field, IUCN has a strong track record both regionally and globally having pioneered tools and*

methods for marine park management and having helped countries establish and run marine parks, notably in Comoros and Kenya.”

IUCN-EARO also noted that *“it had been instrumental in the conceptualisation, development and finalisation of the General Management Plan (GMP) for the Park and that in the development of this plan IUCN coordinated a detailed and comprehensive stakeholder consultation process which resulted in 10 Village Environment Management Plans (VEMPs) and three community consultation workshops including the zoning workshop for the GMP. The VEMP approach is one of IUCN’s initiatives, pioneered in Rufiji, Tanzania”*. IUCN-EARO claimed that *“the MBREMP GMP is the most comprehensively prepared GMP on the East African coast, because it is based on highly detailed baseline assessments of the Marine Park (biodiversity, socio-economic and strategic development framework), thorough community input through the VEMPs, and wider stakeholder input through three large stakeholder consultation workshops”*.

IUCN-EARO concluded that it *“provided technical and programmatic expertise and oversight in conducting 18 scientific studies and assessments in MBREMP and ensured these were published to international standards. Some of the IUCN’s specific input and value addition/outputs are outlined in the mid term evaluation report at end of the Set up Phase, and in the Project’s publication list. It is IUCN’s belief that the scientific quality and the innovative approaches of the work completed with IUCN’s oversight during Phase One is unquestionable and provides a long lasting basis for all subsequent conservation work in MBREMP”*.

The Project Cooperation Agreement served as the contract between the Government as the Executing Agency, and IUCN as *“an implementing agency”* for the project, for the latter to *“be responsible for setting up the project and providing technical support and expertise in accordance with the project document”*. The agreement further specifies that the responsibilities of IUCN-EARO will encompass inter alia – the provision of a full time Technical Advisor; the supervision and implementation of all project-funded activities in the field, including preparation of workplans and their follow-up; preparation of Terms of Reference for studies, reviews and other tasks; the provision of technical and administrative support; and, the maintaining of project accounts.

Although the Agreement is silent on this, IUCN received a management fee of US\$1,200 per month. It was also possible for IUCN staff time, travelling expenses, communications, insurances and reporting and accountancy costs to be charged separately and in addition to the management fee. This arrangement elicited some cynical remarks to the Evaluation Team – the Team was asked rhetorically, *if all these costs are charged separately, what is the management fee for?*

When the question was posed to IUCN-EARO, in turn, by the Team, IUCN-EARO replied that it has a standard management fee of 14% for all projects that it implements in the Eastern African region. However, on this occasion, UNDP negotiated a fee of 5% for the MBREMP Project, a significant reduction. IUCN-EARO also explained that it uses the management fee *“as a cost recovery mechanism and the funds are used to cover time provided by administrative and accounting staff, rent, electricity, security of premises, and representation from both the Nairobi and the Tanzania offices”*. IUCN-EARO continued that this management fee *“is an overhead fee and should not be confused with costs incurred by IUCN for providing technical input, coordination and oversight which are all charged per specific activity and involved the time of technical project staff such as the Marine Coordinator, the Marine Project Officer, etc”*.

3.1.6 The role of UNDP

As Implementing Agency for GEF, UNDP is responsible to the GEF for the timely and cost-effective delivery of the agreed project outputs and it achieves this through its understanding with the Government. UNDP has an obligation to ensure accountability, and its efforts in this respect are spearheaded by the Country Office which has legal responsibility for the GEF funds.

UNDP was also charged with the responsibility for the administrative and financial management of FFEM funding in the name of the Government.

The UNDP Resident Representative in Tanzania may approve, following consultation and agreement with the UNDP/GEF Regional Office and the Government signatories to the project document, revisions or additions to any of the annexes of the ProDoc, revisions which do not involve significant changes in the immediate objectives, outputs or activities of the project, and mandatory annual revisions which re-phase the delivery of agreed project inputs or increased expert or other costs due to inflation or to take into account agency expenditure flexibility. The UNDP Resident Representative also co-chairs the Annual Tripartite Review, coordinates inputs into the annual Project Implementation Review for submission to UNDP/GEF, ensures that project objectives are advanced through the policy dialogue with the Government and undertakes official transmission of reports to the national GEF Operational Focal Point.

The work of the UNDP Country Office is supported by the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Office, which also provides coordination within the whole UNDP/GEF portfolio of projects for the region. More specifically, the UNDP/GEF Regional Office provides technical support to the UNDP Country Office and the Government GEF Operational Focal Point, assists the executing agency with the recruitment of senior project personnel, approves the project inception report and terminal reports, reviews budget revisions prior to signature, follows up closely on implementation progress, assures the eligibility of project interventions in light of GEF policy guidance and approved project design, represents UNDP/GEF on the PSC, and approves Annual Project Implementation Reports, including performance ratings, for submission to GEF.

As is accepted practice, UNDP receives a fee aimed at reimbursing the costs of project development and supervision, and for monitoring project implementation.

The Country Office has attempted to balance its responsibilities as outlined above with the delegation of responsibility that is implied in the NEX modality. UNDP has provided support and backstopping to the project by training project staff in NEX administration procedures (invitation to the NEX retreat annually) and monitored its performance through regular field visits every six months, participation in the PSC meetings and contributions to the mandatory annual reporting tasks.

3.2 Financial management

It is not the function of this terminal evaluation to perform a financial audit, however, the team was asked to comment on some aspects of financial management. The following discussion is based on the questions raised in the ToRs.

3.2.1 Overall observations

The involvement of many layers made financial management somewhat complicated, especially during the First Phase. IUCN also lamented the complexity created by the funding base which came from two sources and two separate budgets under UNDP-GEF and FFEM co-financing. They noted that *“FFEM co-financing had separate rules and regulations with very specific activities to support”*. However, as FFEM pointed out, *“co-financing with different rules is inherent to international cooperation projects and this project was not more complex than others. FFEM also noted that their “rules are not more demanding than GEF UNDP ones, and UNDP was charged with the administrative management of FFEM funds to ensure consistency with GEF funds”*.

However, in spite of these difficulties, finances were adequately managed in both phases, there was no obvious waste and no extravagance, and value for money has been achieved. Problems that arose with the disbursement process are discussed below, but even these do not detract from the

above conclusion reached by the Team who appreciated the efficiency and transparency with which both IUCN (for the First Phase) and the PMU (for the Second Phase), were able to satisfy our requests for information.

There was also a third source of funding – the Government. Throughout the project, the Government provided core funding to cover salaries and some of the operational costs for the establishment and operations of MBREMP. This funding support was even more significant during the Second Phase when Park personnel, funded by the Government, served as the Project Management Unit, and only the Technical Advisor was funded from GEF/FFEM sources.

3.2.2 Financial planning

Financial planning, as evidenced by the ProDoc version available to the Team, was fraught with inconsistent amounts and confusion. The cover page in the ProDoc indicated a budget of US\$3,569,224 of which US\$1,495,424 was from the GEF (excluding the PDF stages) and US\$98,000 was from co-financing (IUCN and communities). Parallel projects “contributed” a nominal US\$1,760,000 as co-financing and there was also a Government contribution in kind which was valued at US\$215,800. Then, page A-3, Section 3: Costs and Financing, provides a fair amount of detail but creates difficulties when attempting to reconcile the figures with those on the cover page.

The table in the ProDoc page A-22, provides the budget by Components (Immediate Objectives), divided into the Set-Up Phase and the Implementation Phase, and this is reproduced below. The Team notes that the total figures given in this table do not tally with the totals on the cover page of the ProDoc, except for the GEF amount.

Table 2. Original budget, by Component, and according to Phase (from ProDoc)

| PROJECT COMPONENTS | PHASE ONE | PHASE TWO | TOTAL GEF | CO-FINANCING | TOTAL | % |
|---|----------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|------------|
| Component A Participatory planning and Park management | 653,960 | 343,240 | 997,200 | 203,800 | 1,201,000 | 54.3 |
| Component B Sustainable livelihoods | 51,000 | 64,000 | 115,000 | 50,000 | 165,000 | 7.4 |
| Component C Capacity building | 49,350 | 31,200 | 80,550 | 18,000 | 98,550 | 4.4 |
| Component D Monitoring and evaluation | 177,074 | 125,600 | 302,674 | 42,000 | 344,674 | 15.6 |
| Un-Allocated Co-finance | - | - | - | 400,000 | 400,000 | 18.3 |
| TOTAL | 931,384 | 564,040 | 1,495,424 | 713,800¹⁰ | 2,209,224 | 100 |

The table illustrates the focus that was placed at the outset on the participatory planning and management activities, with over 50% of budget resources, which is laudable. The next highest allocation is for monitoring and evaluation which is just under 16%. This Component is described as *“... This component tracks project management effectiveness and efficiency, as opposed to Protected Area effectiveness. Monitoring PA effectiveness is a feedback mechanism within the management planning process and is in Component A. This component has result areas looking at financial systems, equipment use, staff performance and assesses progress against log-frame based work plans”*. On this basis, and while not questioning the importance of project performance monitoring, the Team feels that this allocation may be excessive.

¹⁰ This figure (US\$713,800) was the anticipated amount during the ProDoc formulation but after the conclusion of the agreement with FFEM, the agreed amount was €630,000.

FFEM co-financing of €630,000 was approved in late 2002 and earmarked 48% for Component A (primarily for the knowledge base result area) and 33% directed to Component B to reflect an FFEM internal rule that conservation work should be linked to local development. The funds were made available to the project in September 2004.

It must also be acknowledged that in addition to GEF and FFEM, which were the two major funders of this project, others such as UNDP, IUCN and the Government have also provided co-financing both in cash and in kind.

In the opinion of the Team and when comparing it with similar projects elsewhere, the overall budget allocated to this project was adequate for the activities envisaged but not excessive. What led to the unspent balance of FFEM funds at the end of the UNDP/GEF project, was the lack of time available to carry out the planned activities which resulted from the delays experienced during the transition between Phase One and Phase Two.

3.2.3 The disbursement process

IUCN-EARO advised the Team that during Phase One, UNDP disbursed funds to IUCN-EARO on a quarterly basis, in advance, for quarterly work plans and budgets that had been pre-approved. IUCN-EARO then transferred the appropriate component of the quarterly budget to the MPRU Mtwara office (the Marine Park Office) for immediate use. During the Second Phase the process was simplified by UNDP disbursing funds directly to the Marine Park Office in Mtwara.

The First Phase arrangement required the Marine Park Office, through the MPRU, to submit monthly financial expense reports to IUCN-EARO, and IUCN-EARO was in turn required to submit Quarterly financial and narrative Reports together with a work plan and budget for the next quarter, to the MPRU Manager for approval and onward transmission to UNDP, and so the cycle began again. Once again, the process was simplified during the Second Phase because MPRU dealt directly with UNDP.

IUCN-EARO noted that transfers from Nairobi to Mtwara were taking between two and three weeks, and even when an overseas correspondent bank was used, the situation did not improve consistently and in some instances the project was short of funds due to the delays. This was counteracted by maintaining a reasonable balance in the account to cover transfer delays, and by transferring two months of funding needs in advance. Obviously, this problem did not occur in the Second Phase.

In addition to the delays experienced between Nairobi and Mtwara, there were also delays between UNDP in Dar es Salaam and IUCN-EARO in Nairobi. IUCN-EARO reported that in the period between June 2002 and May 2004, the delay ranged from 11 days to just over two months.

In an attempt to avoid hindering project progress, IUCN-EARO pre-financed MBREMP unilaterally and advanced funds for each quarter while waiting for the funds from UNDP. This procedure was not favoured by UNDP since it introduced the possibility of disbursements which had not been approved and which then required retroactive approval. IUCN-EARO defended the practice since ... *"IUCN-EARO's support in such circumstances was based on trust and the desire to ensure that the work plan was implemented within agreed timelines"*.

According to IUCN-EARO, when funds were delayed and it was not able to provide pre-finance, project activities often came to a standstill and IUCN-EARO could not honour contractual obligations. This *"had serious repercussions for IUCN's reputation as an organisation"* and *"consultants threatened to sue IUCN and some of these consultants have refused to undertake further work for IUCN as a result of this"*.

Without wishing to assign responsibilities for this unacceptable state of affairs, the Evaluation Team notes that these problems did not occur during the Second Phase when the disbursement was made directly by UNDP to the Marine Park Unit / Project Management Unit, through the MPRU. In contracting an international organization to serve as implementing agency for a project, thus introducing an additional administrative layer, the Government and UNDP need to balance these risks with the benefits that such an arrangement is expected to bring to the project. These benefits were discussed in section 3.1.5 above.

The PMU provided the Team with a record of actual expenditure against budget forecasts together with the calculated variance and this is reflected in Table 3 below. Analysis of this table brought out a matter of some concern – this was the terminology and approach adopted by the UNDP Accounting System. FFEM funds were placed in bulk, into the Atlas Activity 1 budget line which is part of Component A from the LogFrame perspective. According to the PMU, the funds were used mainly under Activity 4 (Component B) with other allocations to both Activity 2 (Component A) and Activity 3 (Component C). According to UNDP, the reason for this was to capture administrative costs as agreed with FFEM and allow UNDP to determine the extent of FFEM expenditure. The Team feels that while this is justified from the accounting perspective, it can lead to confusion especially by anyone not aware of the Atlas reporting procedure for cost sharing funds. It also created a distortion with actual expenditure on specific activities on the ground which is driven by the Work Plan, and a reconciliation was required each time. The Team recommends that the Atlas system be tailored to ensure that its expenditure report is in harmony with actual expenditure as in the project's books of accounts.

In the following table provided by the PMU, the first two periods (July to December 2005 and January to December 2006), show the real expenditure per activity. By the third period (January to September 2007) the PMU had adopted the UNDP Atlas system. It is interesting to note that actual expenditure was around 80% of forecast when real expenditure against activities was used; but this dropped to 70%, when the UNDP distorted system was applied. It also led to the apparent overspending under Activity 1, which was not the case.

The Team believes that budgets are not only for accounting purposes – they are an essential tool of good project management. The system applied by UNDP to this project did not provide the necessary assistance to the PMU.

Table 3. Actual expenditure as against forecasts (in TZ Shillings)

| PERIOD | FORECAST BUDGET | ACTUAL EXPENDITURE | VARIANCE % |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| JULY - DECEMBER 2005 | | | |
| ACTIVITY 1 | 108,300,000.00 | 70,040,425.00 | 35.33 |
| ACTIVITY 2 | 30,950,000.00 | 9,108,750.00 | 70.57 |
| ACTIVITY 3 | 26,900,000.00 | 362,000.00 | 98.65 |
| ACTIVITY 4 | 79,415,000.00 | 4,988,100.00 | 93.72 |
| ACTIVITY 5 | 223,846,000.00 | 32,880,649.34 | 85.31 |
| TOTAL | 469,411,000.00 | 117,379,924.34 | 74.99 |
| JANUARY - DECEMBER 2006 | | | |
| ACTIVITY 1 | 81,950,000.00 | 7,089,700.00 | 91.35 |
| ACTIVITY 2 | 102,910,000.00 | 28,079,745.00 | 72.71 |
| ACTIVITY 3 | 60,981,650.00 | 19,100,941.00 | 68.68 |
| ACTIVITY 4 | | | 90.01 |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| | 342,513,350.00 | 34,225,657.00 | |
| ACTIVITY 5 | 436,310,000.00 | 94,962,419.56 | 78.24 |
| TOTAL | 1,024,665,000.00 | 183,458,462.56 | 82.10 |
| JANUARY - SEPTEMBER 2007 | | | |
| ACTIVITY 1 | 21,500,000.00 | 95,426,900.00 | (343.85) |
| ACTIVITY 2 | 90,965,000.00 | 5,333,300.00 | 94.14 |
| ACTIVITY 3 | 35,450,000.00 | 6,525,350.00 | 81.59 |
| ACTIVITY 4 | 196,650,000.00 | 1,158,000.00 | 99.41 |
| ACTIVITY 5 | 214,665,000.00 | 60,646,567.14 | 71.75 |
| TOTAL | 559,230,000.00 | 169,090,117.14 | 69.76 |

As an indication of the proportion of funds spent in-country, the Team obtained disbursement figures for consultancy fees and equipment from the PMU. Disbursements made in US dollars were considered as having been spent externally, those in TZ shillings were seen as spent in-country. As can be seen from the table below, the amounts are not too different, with 46% of funds being spent in-country and 54% being spent externally. It is interesting to note that the greater part of equipment purchases were made in-country and the only items sourced externally were SCUBA diving equipment and outboard motors.

Table 4. Proportion of funds spent in-country and externally, in US\$

| ITEM | EXPENDITURE IN-COUNTRY | EXPENDITURE EXTERNAL | TOTAL |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| National consultants | 2,110 | - | 2,110 |
| International consultants | - | 60,760 | 60,760 |
| Equipment | 90,065 | 48,184 | 138,249 |
| TOTALS | 92,175 (46%) | 108,944 (54%) | 201,119 (100%) |

3.2.4 Co-Financing

The Evaluation Team was required to validate that the co-finance that had been committed had actually been raised.

The ProDoc makes a distinction between “direct” co-financing and “indirect” co-financing. And, there are two types of direct co-financing – that which was committed at the time of submission for CEO endorsement and which comprised a total of US\$313,800 (Government US\$215,800 in-kind, IUCN US\$42,000, and Communities US\$56,000); and the US\$400,000 which was still expected and which eventually took the shape of €630,000 from FFEM.

The indirect co-financing led to a request by GEFSEC for clarification. In response, project proponents explained that *“In-direct co-financing” refers to funds that are negotiated as co-financing, but are not managed directly by the project’s management unit. They are not parallel, but directly affect the outcomes of the project.* It was not possible for the Team to ascertain whether these funds had indeed been spent by other initiatives and the extent to which they may have affected the project outcomes.

The team traced the direct co-financing to the extent possible and was able to ascertain that the greater part of the funds had been raised.

The Government contribution in kind, which was valued at US\$215,800, has been well and truly spent mainly as salaries of Park personnel who also had the role of project personnel, but also to cover some operational costs and some community activities.

The FFEM co-financing of €630,000 (an improvement on the US\$400,000 that had been targeted) was approved in late 2002 and the funds were made available to the project in September 2004. Unfortunately, the project has not been able to utilize all the funds within the agreed timeframe and some €200,000 will be reabsorbed by FFEM at the end of 2007. At the time of this evaluation, this matter was the subject of negotiations between UNDP (on behalf of the Park and the Government) and FFEM (see also section 5.6 below and Annex 8).

The ProDoc identified US\$42,000 as co-financing from IUCN and this was confirmed by IUCN who advised the Team that *“IUCN provided an in-kind and cash contribution to the MBREMP project, considered as co-financing to the Project”*. However, the Team is not in a position to determine whether, to what extent, and for what activities, these funds had been committed. Likewise for the co-financing tagged to the communities and amounting to US\$56,000.

It follows from the above that the sum of US\$713,800 that had been committed as direct co-financing, was increased to US\$943,800 through the increased funding from FFEM¹¹. The Team was able to ascertain that of this, US\$845,800 had indeed been raised, but could not verify the status of the remaining US\$98,000. However, out of the funds that had been raised through co-financing, the project was able to use only US\$645,800, and US\$200,000 may be reabsorbed.

3.3 Stakeholder participation

3.3.1 The Mtwara Declaration

On 7-8 April 1999, 62 representatives from Government, community leaders, the private sector and NGOs met for a two-day workshop held at the Parish Hall in Mtwara to discuss the proposed setting up of the Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park. Having considered the needs of the local people, the natural resources available and the threats to those resources, the participants resolved to support the creation of the Marine Park as a mechanism for ensuring the wise management and sustainability of benefits from the coastal and marine resources of the District. The Evaluation Team sees the Mtwara Declaration (see Annex 6) that came out of the workshop, as an absolute milestone for the project and for the Park. It is an excellent manifestation of the involvement of stakeholders in setting up the Marine Park and their commitment to it.

3.3.2 Participation at the Project formulation phase

The project formulation team respected the spirit of the Mtwara Declaration. According to the ProDoc, the project was prepared with the benefit of a detailed Social Assessment and stakeholder involvement. The Social Assessment was extensive, targeting local communities over a period of 14 months and involving a team of Tanzanian experts with assistance from IUCN-EARO and other experts. The activities that were carried out included:

- Preliminary social assessment conducted by the Marine Parks Unit and the IMS in February 1998
- Social Assessment and data gathering by a team of socioeconomic specialists in June-August 1998
- Assessment of institutional issues and an institutional analysis by the MPRU in August 1998
- Technical Advisory mission conducted by Graeme Kelleher and Associates in March 1999
- Local stakeholder and institutional partner workshops held in April 1999

¹¹ For budgeting purposes it was agreed that the FFEM funds which were in Euros would be considered as equivalent to US Dollars on a one-to-one basis.

- Field mission by IUCN-EARO/UNDP and the MPRU in August 1999

As the ProDoc states, the project committed to “*establish a formal role for communities in decision-making through a system of village committees, a Marine Parks Advisory Committee, and representation on the Project Steering Committee. The project actively seeks to engage all target groups in MPA management and AIG activities, and will empower communities to care for the resources on which they depend for survival*”.

Furthermore, the ProDoc identified the primary stakeholders of the project as the villagers living in and around Mnazi Bay and the estuary of the Ruvuma River. As revealed by the Social Assessment, these people are among the poorest in the Mtwara District and depend heavily on the marine products of Mnazi Bay for their livelihoods. As such they were expected to be the most strongly affected by the declaration of a marine park and were therefore seen as priority targets for project activities.

Other stakeholders and beneficiaries that were identified in the ProDoc include:

- Private sector businesses that plan to utilize Bay resources for fisheries, tourism or other development
- National, Regional and District agencies with sectoral responsibilities (e.g. TPDC, fisheries, forestry)
- The Mtwara District Council which has overall responsibility for activities within the District
- The BoT and MPRU which have responsibility for the development of Marine Parks in Tanzania
- Research organizations that carry out scientific studies in Mnazi Bay. This includes the IMS and Frontier.
- The international community that will benefit from protection of the critical biodiversity values of Mnazi Bay and Ruvuma Estuary

3.3.3 Participation during the implementation phase

From the findings of this Evaluation, stakeholder participation continued satisfactorily into the implementation phase of the project.

The project helped established Village Liaison Committees (VLC) which comprised representatives of the village community. The Team met with a number of VLCs and all conveyed a strong message of ownership and commitment to the Park. Many were taking part in project/Park activities on a voluntary basis and these included serving as fish landings monitors, manning the Park gatehouse and collecting Park entry fees, carrying out reef surveys, monitoring turtle nesting sites, and serving as Honorary Rangers. Those who were asked why they did it replied that “*this was their Park*” and they were “*protecting their resources*”. Any critical comment was limited to requests for assistance to enable them to do a better job – a bicycle to travel to the fish landing site 5km away, a torch and whistle for the night watchman, a radio or mobile phone for better communication, etc.

The Team was informed that opportunities for involvement had been biased towards men and that women wished to be more involved than at present. Nevertheless, the Team was pleased to see a good representation of women in its meetings and is aware of a number of women volunteers carrying out various forms of monitoring.

The Park also established a Marine Parks Advisory Committee for Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary comprising representatives from the Village Councils, local businesses, local NGOs and District authorities, appointed by the Permanent Secretary Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism on the recommendation of the Board of Trustees. The Committee is consulted on major planning and management decisions and issues and receives reports from the Warden-in Chief.

The degree of stakeholder participation, both at Government level and at grassroots level, was exemplary. However, there is some room for improvement in the way that communities are

approached and brought on board. We recommend that field staff, even technical personnel, should be provided with training, to empower them with the methodologies to approach community members more sensitively in the future.

3.3.4 The case of Nalingu Village

Of the 11 villages within the Marine Park, only the village of Nalingu has adopted a negative attitude towards the Park with open hostility prevailing at times. The stand-off has existed since early days and the Park has not been able to make any progress whatsoever in resolving the impasse.

The MTE discussed the case of Nalingu at some length and concluded that ...

“the impasse with Nalingu is not irreparable. However, the park must take a more proactive role if the problems are to be solved. We suggest a two-pronged approach:

- 1. As a goodwill gesture, the MBREMP should request (and if necessary lobby for) the withdrawal of the court cases against the 17 defendants.*
- 2. The project should demonstrate in neighbouring villages, as soon as possible, the positive benefits the park can provide”*

In the event, the Marine Park offered to lobby for the cases to be dropped if the villagers could undertake to cooperate with the park. This assurance was not forthcoming and the court cases were not withdrawn, and in spite of successful demonstrations of project activities in neighbouring villages (and whispers of surreptitious enquiries by Nalingu villagers), Nalingu Village is as estranged from the Park as it has ever been.

With the assistance of Municipal Fisheries Officers, the National Consultant on the Evaluation Team was able to visit Nalingu and meet with village representatives. In the discussions, the villagers advised that fish resources were on the increase, but also observed that fishing is seasonal. They prefer using a ring net and a seine net known as kavogo and they are not familiar with longline (zulumati) but some practice handlining (Koto). The villagers noted that the free nets given by the Park during the gear exchange programme may not be suitable inshore but they have proved good offshore.

The Team ascertained that Nalingu people are reluctant in accepting Marine Parks for a number of reasons:

- Representatives who were sent to Mafia to learn on Marine Park felt they were misinformed, “the whole exercise was not transparent” they said.
- They strongly believe that the issue of Marine Parks does not have the blessing of the government, “even the MPs who visited this village of Nalingu did not say so” they asserted.
- They claim that Marine Park is an investment by an English foreigner named “Park Warden”.
- They accept the gas extraction project without any reservations because the investors do not harass them when they fish using illegal gears and in restricted areas.
- “If you want to sell your piece of land you have to get permission from the park authorities. Park people also beat us and take away our fishing gears. What type of government agent treats citizens like this?” They asked.
- “Park authorities prohibit us from fishing in productive areas like corals and sea grass and instead they force us to fish in areas devoid of fish”
- “This conservation project is meant for the rich, not for poor people like us, so we do not like the Marine Park project in our area”

The Team is saddened by the continuing resistance of the people of Nalingu Village and feel that it is not helpful to try and apportion blame for the situation. We are aware of all the sincere efforts made by the PMU and Park personnel to try and bridge this rift between Nalingu Village and the Park. However, we believe that the task is probably beyond the capacity of the Park personnel and recommend that a high ranking person, with credibility in the eyes of the Nalingu people, be brought in to mediate between the Village and the Park.

3.4 Monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring is the repeated, regular measurement or observation of a pre-determined parameter in a strictly consistent manner. It records departures from the baseline as well as trends away from or towards established targets. Analysis of the data obtained from monitoring can be used to predict and forecast outcomes and corrective action can be implemented before impacts become irreversible.

In the case of MBREMP, the Team recognized four types of monitoring. These are discussed in turn below and each is rated, as required, according to the following system:

- Highly Satisfactory: There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system
- Satisfactory: There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system
- Moderately Satisfactory: There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system
- Moderately Unsatisfactory: There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system
- Unsatisfactory: There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system
- Highly Unsatisfactory: The Project had no M&E system

3.4.1 Project performance monitoring and adaptive management

According to the ProDoc, the project will be reviewed annually through UNDP's Tripartite Review (TPR) Mechanisms, which will bring together the Executing Agency (Government), the Implementing Agency (IUCN-EARO for Phase One and MPRU in Phase Two), UNDP (including UNDP/GEF) and other stakeholders. The ProDoc also says that the performance of the MPRU will be monitored and evaluated through the Marine Parks Advisory Committee at the local level, while the PSC will perform the same function at the national level. The performance of the Advisory Committee is meant to be evaluated by the PSC. The Team finds this odd since the PSC is meant to comprise the whole membership of the Advisory Committee with additional members.

The ProDoc commits that evaluation of the project will be in accordance with the policies and procedures established for this purpose by UNDP. These include:

- Quarterly reports from Project Management describing progress with process and output
- Annual Project Report, using UNDP formats to go to Tri-Partite Review Processes
- Discursive annual reports to go to a wider audience
- Inception report. To be completed within 4 months of project start-up
- Terminal report. To be submitted three months before project closure. UNDP formats to be used.
- Consultants and Project Staff as required will compile technical reports. A sufficient output of good quality professional reports on biodiversity issues is seen as a key output of this project.

Strictly speaking, the above have been adhered to and the requirements of UNDP and GEF are satisfied. In addition to the above, the Team is aware that together with the rest of the UNDP projects portfolio, the project was audited annually.

The PMU is operating a Management Oriented Monitoring System (MOMS) – for adaptive management of the Park. Needs have been identified in all fields – Governance, Administration, Community Conservation (socio-economic status, livelihoods, AIGs), Law-enforcement (compliance), Biological monitoring (stock, condition/status, utilisation, sustainability).

This “system”, with its identified modules, is being implemented on a phased basis. As the data collectors and relevant staff, who are responsible for analysing the data and acting on the results by adapting management approaches to counter negative effects or enhance positives, gain experience and confidence, more of the identified modules will be phased in.

The PMU shared with the Team a recent scorecard (October 2007) which assesses progress in achieving management effectiveness goals for marine protected areas (MPAs). MBREMP scored highest in Context and Planning and weakest in Inputs (budget); Outputs and Outcomes were not very high and Process was fair.

The project has definitely put in place a portfolio of monitoring activities and given time, this will become a valuable management asset. The only improvement that can be recommended is the adoption of a comprehensive M&E Plan to provide the framework and cohesion. The Team feels that monitoring activities by the project can be rated as **satisfactory** and recommends that any extension or follow-up should be contingent on a well-structured Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.

3.4.2 The Logical Framework Matrix

The project LogFrame is the most important single tool for guiding project implementation. It is also the basis for adaptive management. It provides a comprehensive summary of the project scope and component elements as well as Indicators to measure progress towards the Objectives/Outcomes. The LogFrame usually also notes the risks and assumptions recognized by the project designers. Monitoring against the LogFrame is an effective way of gauging project progress. However, effective project management requires that the LogFrame itself remains sufficiently “alive” and subject to fine-tuning to reflect changing circumstances, experience gained, and shifts in priorities. Revisions of the LogFrame are a good manifestation of adaptive management.

The MTE found the LogFrame as “good” but queried some of the Indicators (and this Team agrees – see section 4 below) and recommended that *“the logframe could be strengthened for the second phase by adding a broad result on creating/maintaining good relations with the communities, and defining specific objectives (sub-results) for this”*. This recommendation was not implemented and the LogFrame was not revised (even though the sentiments were adopted in other activities).

In fact, the Team has been advised that the original LogFrame from the MBREMP ProDoc has not changed much in the lifetime of the project. But it would seem that there is one exception – the original *Objective D: Project adequately Monitored / Evaluated for Success & Impact*, has not survived. It fails to be mentioned from the 2005 PIR (the earliest available to the Team) onwards. This may have happened as a result of the loose use of terminology with Immediate Objectives, Components, and Outcomes, being used interchangeably. Loose terminology may appear a trivial issue, however, as the PMU observed to the Team, the problem in the case of MBREMP was exacerbated by the two sources of funding support (GEF/UNDP and FFEM), each with its own terminology. The Team can empathize with the PMU who noted that this problem has led to:

- The risk of confusion by partners implementing the Project
- Time wasting in linking the project documents (UNDP/GEF & FFEM analysis) and also linking the components, objectives and outcomes and activities without distorting the original intention
- The risk of overlapping efforts towards implementing and /or achieving the same outcome

The Team recommends to UNDP/GEF that at the time of project formulation, more attention needs to be paid to the accepted terminology as provided in the various templates.

The Team considers the quality of the LogFrame and its use as a tool for project management to have been **moderately satisfactory**, according to the above scale.

3.4.3 Compliance monitoring

Compliance monitoring is undertaken to ascertain that legal requirements are being observed. It targets poaching of wildlife, unlawful tree-felling and other illegal activities not covered by the required permit or licence. Compliance monitoring is normally entrusted to the rangers, wardens and other supervisory staff of responsible Government organizations. In their role as Marine Park

officers, members of the PMU performed their job as wardens of the Park and carried out monitoring activities. They were assisted in this through an Honorary Rangers system which the Park established early on and which comprised community volunteers.

Activities that might be subject to compliance monitoring, which are of relevance to the project, include:

- The use of approved nets (type and mesh size) for fishing
- The areas and zones where fishing was carried out
- The use of illegal methods for fishing (e.g. dynamite)
- The removal or other destruction of mangrove vegetation
- Discharge and other limits on the oil and gas operations
- The release of fuel and lubrication oil or other contaminants into the marine environment
- The mining of coral from the living reef
- The poaching of turtles or turtle eggs, or any other endangered species
- Anchoring on coral or other prohibited areas

According to the ProDoc, the Park staff will work in partnership with village communities to oversee enforcement, carry out monitoring and review the Management Plan. This level of collaboration exists now, even though there is potential for further involvement of community members.

The Team found compliance monitoring to be **moderately satisfactory** while the involvement of communities in monitoring activities, is deemed to have been **satisfactory**.

3.4.4 Ecosystem monitoring

One objective of this monitoring activity, is as an indicator of the health of the ecosystem (the MBREMP) and the results can be used to claim that the project is successful.

Another objective of ecosystem monitoring, possibly more important in this case, is to manage the risks inherent in multi-purpose protected areas. In the case of MBREMP, ecosystem monitoring will provide the ultimate proof that a gas production facility and a marine park are compatible; that 30,000 villagers can live within a marine park without destroying its ecological values; that agricultural and aquacultural activities with their concomitant discharges, are not impacting the ecosystem; etc.

Regular surveys and monitoring such as with indicator species, repeated transects and quadrats, and repeated photographs in critical locations within the Park could be used to ascertain whether the multi-purpose philosophy is working.

A certain amount of ecosystem monitoring is being carried out by volunteers with guidance from the Park personnel and baselines are being established. This includes tallies at fish landings (weekly), turtle nesting sites on a seasonal basis (this could also be considered as compliance monitoring), bird counts (quarterly), coral reef transects (irregularly, but around monthly), etc. Some of this activity was foreseen by the ProDoc which stated that *“Community-based coral reef monitoring activities will provide baseline and ongoing information to assess the status of reef-related resources. Consideration will be given to adapting methods being developed through IUCN/WCPA to measure MPA management effectiveness”*.

The PMU puts great value on ecosystem monitoring as the ultimate proof that their work is having a positive effect. However, they believe that they are still at the stage where they are accumulating data and establishing baselines. There is not enough information yet to influence adaptive management and the main constraint is manpower, not funding.

The rating for ecosystem monitoring is **moderately satisfactory** because while it is still being developed, this rating recognizes its future potential.

Table 5. Progress in achieving management effectiveness in the Marine Park (from scorecard employed by the PMU with the addition of comments from the Evaluation Team – in green) - see discussion below

| CONTEXT: Where are we now? Assessment of importance, threats and policy environment | | | | |
|--|------------------|------------|---|--|
| Legal status – Does the marine protected area have legal status? Note: see fourth option for private reserves | | your score | Comments | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The marine protected area is not gazetted The government has agreed that the marine protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun The marine protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete The marine protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar) | 0 1 2 3 | | <p>The MPA (MBREMP) is legally gazetted. The regulations for the park, as drawn under the Act have also been endorsed and are being applied (See also section below).</p> <p>The Marine Park was in fact gazetted before the formal start of the project. The Team concurs with the score</p> | |
| Marine protected area regulations - Are inappropriate resource uses and activities controlled? | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the marine protected area Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the marine protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the marine protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the marine protected area exist and are being effectively implemented | 0 1 2 3 | | <p>As mentioned above the Park regulations have been endorsed and are being implemented, with some discretionary exceptions. (There are still existing barriers to full implementation. Not all Park Villages are in agreement with the Park and its objectives. The implementation of the full spectrum of illegal fishing gear controls is being phased in along with a gear exchange programme. The physical demarcation of the user zones in the Park is still not fully in place).</p> <p>While the Team agrees with the PMU assessment of the situation and the score, not all shortcomings are the result of barriers – some are merely a reflection of work in progress.</p> | |
| Law enforcement – Can staff enforce marine protected area rules well enough? | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce marine protected area legislation and regulations There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce marine protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills or no patrol budget) The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce marine protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce marine protected area legislation and regulations | 0 1 2 3 | 1,5 | <p>The existing gaps in the present staff components training have been identified and are being redressed through an on-going series of training interventions. However, the existing staff numbers are already inadequate when looking at the required work load; and the absence of staff members on extended periods of training puts additional short-term pressures on those remaining staff members.</p> <p>Staff resources are certainly limited, even taking into account that some are on training and will eventually return to duty. There is also the added concern of inadequate operational budget when the project finishes. The Honorary Rangers System has the potential to mollify this critical assessment, but it is still in its infancy. The Team feels that a score of 1 would be more appropriate.</p> | |
| Additional Points | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are some backup sources of control (e.g. volunteers or military) Fines for infraction are routinely levied | 1 1 | 1 1 | <p>(The patrolling effort of the full-time MPA staff is reinforced through the activities of Community based Honorary Rangers, and the ad-hoc use of members of the National Police force and the Marine Police Unit)</p> <p>Legal actions regularly result in Fines, and confiscations of illegal gear.</p> <p>No additional comment from the Team.</p> | |
| Marine protected area boundary demarcation – is the boundary known and demarcated? | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The boundary of the marine protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents The boundary of the marine protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents | 0 1 2 | | <p>Generally, the MPA boundary as mapped and depicted in the General Management Plan is known by the management authority and the local residents and all relevant user groups, despite its not being appropriately demarcated. The MPA boundaries are consistent with important and obvious geographic features to allow their identification. (Except perhaps the off-shore limit; however this is not critical in terms of management or utilisation activities currently being applied in the area).</p> | |

Tanzania Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Project (MBREMP) : TERMINAL EVALUATION

| | | | |
|--|------------------|--|-------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The boundary of the marine protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated The boundary of the marine protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated | 3 | <p>Discrepancies have been identified in the MPA boundary definition (as compared to the mapped figures in the GMP and other GIS materials) and these need to be addressed and the legal definition revised and regazetted.</p> <p>The completion of the user zone demarcation and its application are partially dependant on this regazettement exercise.</p> <p>The Team confirms the above comments and concurs with the score.</p> | |
| Integration of the MPA in a larger coastal management plan | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no discussion about the integration of the MPA in a larger coastal management plan There is some discussions about the integration of the MPA into a larger coastal management plan but the process has not yet begun The marine protected area is in the process of being integrated into a larger coastal management plan but the process is still incomplete The marine protected area is part of a larger coastal management plan | 0 1 2 3 | <p>The MBREMP is part of the national coastal zone management plan and falls Within the East African Marine Eco-Region..</p> <p>Also, potential for Trans-frontier conservation area with Mozambique as part of the greater Mtwara – Quirim system of MPAs</p> <p>The Team notes the initiative being taken by the Park authorities to achieve an integrated, trans-boundary marine protected area and that a score of 3 is only a matter of time. For the moment, however, the Team concurs with the score assigned by the PMU.</p> | 2,5 |
| Additional Points | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MPA is part of a network of MPAs which collectively sustain larger marine ecosystem functions The MPA is part of a network of MPAs which collectively represent the range of biogeographic variation in a marine ecoregion | 1 1 | No additional comments from the Team. | 1 1 |
| Resource inventory – do you have enough information to manage the area? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is little or no information available on the critical habitats species and cultural values of the marine protected area Information on the critical habitats species and cultural values of the marine protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making Information on the critical habitats species and cultural values of the marine protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained Information concerning the critical habitats. Is there a programme of management-oriented survey and research work? | 0 1 2 3 | <p>As noted elsewhere, the project focussed strongly on establishing the information base for management during its initial stages and this work continues, albeit on a reduced scale. The Team concurs with score assigned, however, adds that with the end of the project and its funding, there is a risk that survey and data gathering will be reduced.</p> | 2,5 |
| TOTAL for Context | 22 | | 17,5 |
| PLANNING – Where do we want to be? Assessment of marine protected area design and planning | | | |
| Marine protected area objectives – Have objectives been agreed? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No firm objectives have been agreed for the marine protected area The marine protected area has agreed objectives The marine protected area has agreed objectives but theses are only partially implemented The marine protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives | 0 1 2 3 | <p>The Team concurs with the score since objectives are known to have been established for the Park. The extent to which these have been agreed (ref. Nalingu village) and are being met, is what prevents a score of 3.</p> | 2,5 |
| Management plan – Is there a management plan and is it being implemented? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no management plan for the marine protected area A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented | 0 1 | <p>The Plan exists and is being implemented, but the Team concurs with the score assigned by the PMU as prudent – implementation could suffer when the project ends, unless there are other sources of funding support, at least in the short term.</p> | |

Tanzania Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Project (MBREMP) : TERMINAL EVALUATION

| | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems An approved management plan exists and is being implemented | 2 3 | 2,5 | |
| Additional Points | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan The results of monitoring research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning Management plan is tied to the development and enforcement of regulation Does the management plan incorporate traditional ecological knowledge from local stakeholders | 1 1 1 1 1 | 1 - 0,5 0,5 1 | No additional comment from the Team and we concur with the score. |
| Regular work plan – is there an annual work plan? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No regular work plan exists A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets but many activities are not completed A regular work plan exists actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed | 0 1 2 3 | | The Team concurs with the score. |
| Additional Point | | | |
| There is a long term master plan (at least 5 years) | 1 | 1 | MPRU has a strategic plan in place – Next GMP as at end 2006 for a five year period |
| TOTAL for Planning | 15 | 11 | |
| INPUTS – What do we need? Assessment of resources needed to carry out management | | | |
| Research | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area There is some ad hoc survey and research work There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of marine protected area management There is a comprehensive integrated programme of survey and research work which is relevant to management needs | 0 1 2 3 | 2,5 | Survey and research work is being undertaken but as the programme is still being established it is still too early to direct it effectively towards management needs. The Team believes that a score of 2 would be more appropriate. |
| Staff numbers – Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no staff Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site | 0 1 2 3 | 1,5 | The lack of staff resources has been commented on above. The Team concurs with the score. |
| Additional Point | | | |
| There is a volunteer program to improve MPA protection Provide details | 1 | -? | |
| Current budget – Is the current budget sufficient? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no budget for the protected area The available budget is adequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully | 0 1 2 | | * Note: The MPA allocated budget, along with the various donor funds are more than adequate to meet the full management needs of the protected area. However, following the withdrawal of the donor project funding there is going to be difficulty in maintaining an effective level and standard of management activity. (See also section below). |

Tanzania Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Project (MBREMP) : TERMINAL EVALUATION

| | | | |
|---|------------------|----------|--|
| achieve effective management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area | 3 | 2* | <p>The problem is currently rather one of insufficient manpower, and other resources such as transport for the full implementation of the management AND development programmes.</p> <p>There is a major need to look at, and find ways to address the long-term sustainable financing issue.</p> <p>As noted in the comment, there is concern surrounding the lack of operational funds which could eventuate at project closure. Unless a new source of funding becomes available, the score will slip to 1.</p> |
| Sustainability of the budget – Is the budget secure? | | | See also the Notes in the section above. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no secure budget for the marine protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding There is very little secure budget and the marine protected area could not function adequately without outside funding There is a reasonably secure core budget for the marine protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding There is a secure budget for the marine protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle | 0 1 2 3 | 1* | <p>The Team concurs with the score assigned. However, we wish to note that the long term potential for the Park to generate its own funding, at least to a great extent if not completely, is very good. The funding crisis, if it does happen, will be short term, but this could set back the Park significantly.</p> |
| TOTAL for Input | 14 | 7 | |
| PROCESS – How do we go about it? Assessment of the way in which management is conducted | | | |
| Resource management – Is the marine protected area adequately managed? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed | 0 1 2 3 | | <p>The Team concurs with the score.</p> |
| Additional Point | | | |
| <p>There is an Emergency Response Capacity in place to minimize impacts from a broad range of potential incidents</p> <p>Provide details</p> | 1 | 0.5 | <p>Red Cross, TCAA and other Emergency response programmes to react to Tsunami and other flooding and emergency "Accident" situations.</p> <p>More regular coral bleaching checks being implemented, and feed back given to and information sharing with regional and Global agencies.</p> <p>The Team has no further comments.</p> |
| Equipment – Is the site adequately equipped? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is little or no equipment and facilities There is some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate Most of the equipment and facilities are adequate and maintained There is adequate equipment and facilities and it is well maintained | 0 1 2 3 | 2 | <p>The MBREMP is currently in the process of undertaking an accelerated period of procurement to address some of the remaining gaps in the availability of equipment. Facilities such as infrastructure for MPA management are also in the procurement phase.</p> <p>The Team concurs with the score assigned but adds that the constraint in procurement of equipment has been more lack of time than lack of budget.</p> |
| Staff training – Is there enough training for staff? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff are untrained Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the marine protected area Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully | 0 1 2 | 2 | <p>There are two primary levels of staff training within the staff component of MBREMP.</p> <p>There are a number of staff who are at this level especially in the field (implementation) areas of park management</p> |

Tanzania Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Project (MBREMP) : TERMINAL EVALUATION

| | | | |
|--|------------------|--------|---|
| achieve the objectives of management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the marine protected area, and with anticipated future needs | 3 | | There are a number of the staff who are at this level, especially in the administrative governance areas of management. The Team concurs with the score assigned and adds that staff, even technical staff, would benefit from training in methodologies for approaching communities and gaining their confidence and cooperation. |
| Education and awareness programme – Is there a planned education programme? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no education and awareness programme There is a limited and ad hoc education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area | 0 1 2 3 | | On-going programme in place but still has some serious gaps. There are currently efforts being made to redress the gaps. The Team agrees that an awareness programme is in place, however, there are also serious gaps in sensitizing and engaging communities. We believe that while the current situation would merit a score of 2, given time, the Park could easily achieve a score of 3. |
| Communication | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is little or no communication between managers and stakeholders involved in the MPA There is communication between managers and stakeholders but this is not a planned or scheduled programme. There is a planned communication programme that is being used to build support for the MPA amongst relevant stakeholders but implementation is limited yet. There is a planned communication programme that is being implemented to build support for the MPA amongst relevant stakeholders. | 0 1 2 3 | | The Team concurs with the score assigned by the PMU |
| Additional Point | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a communication programme that is being implemented with the local communities. There is some communication with other MPA managers (and for example exchanges of good practices) | 1 1 | 1 1 | The Team concurs with this grading |
| Indigenous people – Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the MPA have input to management decisions? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management | 0 1 2 3 | | There are a number of mechanisms in place for the facilitation of participative decision making in the management of MBREMP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board of Trustees Advisory Committee Village Liaison Committees Village Assembly meetings when necessary If all the above are making decisions for the Park, they must be cancelling each other out. The Team feels that the key body for decision-making by communities for the Park is the Advisory Committee, and concurs with the score of 2. |
| Local communities – Do local communities resident or near to the MPA have input to management decisions? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management | 0 1 2 3 | | The Team concurs with this score |

Tanzania Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Project (MBREMP) : TERMINAL EVALUATION

| | | | | |
|---|------------------|-------------------|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management | | | | |
| Commercial tourism – Do commercial tour operators contribute to marine protected area management? | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain marine protected area values There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts | 0 1 2 3 | 1.5 | <p>There is only small scale tourism in MBREMP at present.</p> <p>There is currently progress being made with the preparation of a TIF and this will lead to the investment process within the Park. This process is being designed so as to address issues of close cooperation between the management authorities and the potential operators/investors from the outset of large scale tourism development.</p> <p>While the extent of tourism activities in the Park is currently limited, the Team has recorded good co-operation between the Park and the tourism operators and would consider a score of 2 as more appropriate.</p> | |
| Additional Point | | | | |
| There are clear financial contributions / agreements between MPA and tourism operators to recover MPA resources rents for local benefits | 1 | 0.5 | <p>This is partially functional only: ie. Entry fees (ECO2 and others)</p> <p>The Team agrees that the fees system and other aspects of funding in the Park are still in their infancy and agrees with the score.</p> | |
| Monitoring and evaluation | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no monitoring and evaluation of the marine protected area indicators There is some ad hoc monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management | 0 1 2 3 | 2.5 | <p>There is now some more structured monitoring and evaluation on-going in MBREMP through the implementation of a Management Oriented Monitoring System (MOMS)) to facilitate the adaptive management approach in MBREMP. A basic range of modules has been developed as the start of a greater strategy for the monitoring of a range of identified key criteria and indicators.</p> <p>However, there are still gaps between the current and the desired long-term situation.</p> <p>The Team agrees there are gaps and the score may be more appropriate at 2.</p> | |
| Additional Points | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the MPA participate as a site in any national or international environmental monitoring programmes such as CARICOMP, CPACC, GCRMN, AGGRA or similar? (Provide the name of the programme(s)) Source(s) of main water pollution are known. | 1 1 | 1 - | <p>CORDIO,</p> <p>The Team concurs</p> <p>There are large gaps in this area.</p> <p>No additional comment</p> | |
| TOTAL for Process | 33 | 22.5 | | |
| OUTPUT – What were the results? Assessment of the implementation of management programmes and actions; delivery of products and services | | | | |
| Visitor facilities – Are visitor facilities good enough? | | your score | Comments | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no visitor facilities and services Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation | 0 1 2 3 | 1 | <p>The Team is unaware of any visitor facilities or services and would score this as 0 at the moment</p> | |
| Additional Point | | | | |
| There is some awareness training/orientation on site (poster, pamphlet, training for divers...) | 1 | 0.5 | <p>Not as yet (although there is a spin off in this area from community extension and outreach activities (CE&O) (Posters at entry points etc.)</p> | |

Tanzania Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Project (MBREMP) : TERMINAL EVALUATION

| Fees – If fees (entry fees, fines) are applied, do they help marine protected area management? | | | | | There is good potential to provide awareness materials through the very cooperative dive operator |
|---|---|----|------------|-----|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the marine protected area or its environs The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area There is a fee for visiting the marine protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas | 0 | | | | There is a fee, it is currently only being collected in certain "core" areas of the MPA. What is being collected is paid into the CDTF (Conservation, development trust fund) of the Marine parks and reserves unit (MPRU). This fund does disburse funds back into the MPA and its resident communities. |
| | 1 | | | | |
| | 2 | | | | The Team agrees with the assessment of the current situation and the score |
| | 3 | | | 2.5 | |
| Additional Points | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and marine protected area managers | 1 | | 0.5 | | This is the case in most of the MPA villages but Nalingu and its sub-villages remain resistant and hostile to the Park and this sentiment is beginning to show signs of starting in some other villages (especially Msimbati). |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving marine protected area resources, are being implemented | 1 | | 0.5 | | There are a number of pilot AIG schemes in place, however, those which have proved more potentially successful now need to be grown out to achieve an economy of scale, where they can really become meaningful to community members and in relieving the pressures on the marine resources. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the marine protected area and/or the marine protected area buffer zone | 1 | | - | | Not as yet / such restoration programmes are urgently required in some areas. A current programme aimed at the condition monitoring of coral reefs is a first step in this direction. |
| TOTAL for Output | | 10 | 5.0 | | The Team concurs with the assessment and the scores and has no further comment |
| OUTCOME – What did we achieve? Assessment of the outcomes and the extent to which they achieved objectives | | | | | |
| Condition assessment – Is the marine protected area being managed consistent with its objectives? | | | your score | | Comments |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded. Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded. Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural value are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted. Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact. | 0 | | | | Past pressures (pre MPA proclamation) still require redress and mitigation. |
| | 1 | | | | The Team concurs with the score |
| | 2 | | | 2 | |
| | 3 | | | | |
| Additional Point | | | | | |
| Some of the biodiversity, ecological values are restored/enhanced | 1 | | 0.5 | | Dynamite fishing which was brought under control some time ago is still in hand, other destructive fishing practices being addressed through gear exchange and education programmes. Coral mining in the buffer zone of the park is again on the increase and is having negative impacts in the park as well. |
| | | | | | The Team feels that the PMU assessment does not address the indicator. What the PMU is addressing is the reduction in impact; while the Indicator targets restoration. The Team sees this as a score of 0. |
| Access assessment – Are the available management mechanisms working to control access or use? | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives. Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives. Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives. | 0 | | | | Control is specific to certain geographic locations (ie. Certain core areas) and the success is only partial in those areas. (See also section above). |
| | 1 | | | 1 | The Team agrees with the assessment and concurs with the score assigned. |
| | 2 | | | | |

Tanzania Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Project (MBREMP) : TERMINAL EVALUATION

| | | | |
|--|------------------|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives. | 3 | | |
| Additional Point | | | |
| Add a point if carrying capacity studies on various forms of use are routinely done to set limits on use. | 1 | 0.5 | <p>There are certain routine monitoring studies which are relevant to this – The tourism investment framework (TIF) and the currently proposed review of this; turtle nesting and hatching success as well as fish catch/effort monitoring.</p> <p>The Team sees this indicator differently from the PMU. The monitoring studies mentioned are not related to carrying capacity which may be very difficult in a Park which has 30,000 inhabitants as well as a production gas/oil field. A more appropriate score would be 0.</p> |
| Economic benefit assessment – Is the marine protected area providing economic benefits to local communities? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existence of the marine protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities. The existence of the marine protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy. There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the marine protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy. There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to regional and local communities from activities in and around the marine protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc). | 0 1 2 3 | <p>Predominantly a 1 score... but</p> <p>1.5</p> <p>The Team agrees that benefits to the local economy have yet to materialize and that this will take time; the score reflects the current situation.</p> | |
| TOTAL for Outcome | 11 | 5.5 | |
| SUMMARY | | | |
| Context | 22 | 17.5 | 79.56% |
| Planning | 15 | 11 | 73.33% |
| Input | 14 | 7 | 50.0% |
| Process | 33 | 22.5 | 68.18% |
| Output | 10 | 5 | 50% |
| Outcome | 11 | 5.5 | 55% |
| Grand TOTAL | 105 | 68.5 | 65.24% Average (62.68% Mean) |
| | | | 61.9% |

3.4.5 Overall conclusion on monitoring for management effectiveness

The PMU has used a score card to assess progress in achieving management effectiveness in the Marine Park and shared one such score card which had been attached to the 2007 PIR, with the Team. While not recognized specifically as such, the score card comprises the same elements as the World Bank/WWF Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), namely Context, Planning, Inputs, Processes, Outputs, and Outcomes.

Table 5 above reproduces the assessment section of the score card with the addition of comments by the Evaluation Team. The original scoring and comments by the PMU are shown in blue font while comments from the Evaluation Team are shown in green.

By and large, the Team concurs with the assessments of the situation and the scores awarded by the PMU, however, there are some slight differences of opinion. While the final result is not too different, the Team has scored the MBREMP slightly lower than the PMU. However, as the authors of the METT¹² noted, “The whole concept of “scoring” progress is fraught with difficulties and possibilities for distortion” and its limitations should therefore be acknowledged. The Team believes that the METT becomes a useful tool when it is used regularly, by the same persons (e.g. PMU), over a period of time (e.g. over the life of a project).

4 FINDINGS: RESULTS AND IMPACTS

4.1 Results achieved

4.1.1 The Development Objective

According to the ProDoc, the Goal of the Project was to: *Conserve a representative example of internationally significant and threatened marine biodiversity*

And, the project Development Objective was to: *Enable local and government stakeholders to protect effectively and utilise sustainably the marine biodiversity and resources of Mnazi Bay and the Ruvuma Estuary.*

The Evaluation Team sees little value in splitting out the Goal and the Development Objective. Both are meant to be high level targets for the project to aim for, knowing that they cannot be achieved through the project alone. We have therefore concentrated on the Development Objective which, if achieved, will contribute to the conservation of a representative example ... etc (as targeted by the Goal).

As is usually the case with the high level nature of development objectives, it is difficult to assess progress directly. Therefore, in its attempt to facilitate the assessment of progress towards the Development Objective, the ProDoc selected four indicators (one with sub-sections) as in the following table, and one was added later. The table also records the views of the Project Management Unit and the comments of the Evaluation Team.

¹² Stolton, Sue, Marc Hockings, Nigel Dudley, Kathy MacKinnon and Tony Whitten (2003) *Reporting Progress in Protected Areas - A Site-Level Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool*. World Bank/WWF Alliance for Forest Conservation and Sustainable Use. Washington

Table 5. Assessment of progress towards the indicators of the Development Objective

| Development Objective: <i>Enable local and government stakeholders to protect effectively and utilise sustainably the marine biodiversity and resources of Mnazi Bay and the Ruvuma Estuary</i> | | |
|--|--|--|
| ORIGINAL INDICATORS FOR DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE (from LogFrame and PIR) | ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS BY PROJECT MANAGEMENT UNIT | COMMENTS BY THE EVALUATION TEAM |
| 1. Effective management of the MPA: the MPA Management Plan is being highly complied with (continuing absence of destructive fishing practices) | Development of the General Management Plan, Village Environmental Management Plans, and subsidiary legislation (Park regulations), have laid a firm foundation for the effective management of the Park. Compliance to the principles, policies, objectives and legislative requirements is generally good. The absence of destructive fishing methods and gear is also being well complied with. This has been achieved to great extent through awareness raising, and enforcement of the legislation and regulations and supported and facilitated through the implementation of the phased gear exchange programme aimed at reducing and eradicating destructive gear. Currently, there is a high degree of compliance from resource users and local community in the Park area. | In the short time that the Evaluation Team had within the park, both on land and on the water, it became aware of only one possible infringement – a young boy using a monofilament net. However, it has no reason to doubt the assessment of the PMU that this indicator is being met. |
| 2. Adoption of viable AIG projects that are vital to achievement of the MPA goals | Following a consultancy to assess the park context and to assess possible AIG options, a number of AIG options were piloted and two of them (beekeeping and mariculture i.e. fish farming and crab fattening) have proved to be the most viable. The process of developing business plans for these most viable projects is underway to facilitate their development and expansion and to allow them to operate at an economy of scale. In this way the potential benefits may be optimized for the target beneficiary groups. | The Team was shown a number of AIG activities, all in the early stages of development. They all seemed well established and the prospects appear good. However, the Team has two areas of concern. The first is the need to provide the producers with a business-like approach and this is claimed to be in-hand by the PMU. The second concern is the lack of any stock assessment and the capture methods used to collect milkfish fry and juvenile crabs for farming. The Team feels that the PMU has some way to go towards this Indicator. |
| 3. a) Effective stakeholder participation in management | Stakeholders are participating effectively in the management of the Park through their representatives in village councils and other statutory organs such as Village Liaison Committees and the Advisory Committee. Community members are also being used as honorary rangers and as monitors and data collectors for various aspects of biological and governance monitoring. (i.e. entrance fees, and visitor numbers at Msimbati entrance gate, turtle breeding success, fish catch/effort monitoring, coral condition monitoring). | Many of the village people met by the Team were participating in some activity of the Park. However, the numbers were very small when taken within the context of 30,000 people who live within the Park. The Team does not consider representation on village councils, etc, as <u>effective participation</u> and feels that this Indicator needs to be achieved in some other ways. |
| 3. b) stakeholder perception that they are consulted and involved in management and that management is effective | Stakeholders are aware that marine park philosophy/approach is participatory hence they are supposed to be consulted and involved at different management levels such as: decision making, benefit sharing and implementation of the Park activities, monitoring and evaluation | The Team finds this Indicator strange, as written – it would be satisfied even if people were fooled into thinking that they were being consulted. It needs to be replaced. |
| 3. c) regular Village Council and Advisory Committee meetings (and Advisory Committee includes local community representatives) | The Park is working very closely with village councils through Village Liaison Committees (VLCs) which, together with the Advisory Committee, are statutory organs. The Advisory Committee undertakes general oversight of the Park management and advises the Board of Trustees. The MBREMP Advisory Committee constitutes a representative forum of MBREMP stakeholders, including local community representatives, Regional and District government, a non governmental organization, a research institution and the private business sector (tourism and fish processing investors) within the Park area | If it is merely seeking that meetings take place, this Indicator is being met. It would be more revealing to consider the outcomes of these meetings. |
| 3. d) Board of Trustees meets at least every six months and includes local community representation | The BoT meets at least twice a year and has provision for extraordinary meetings whenever the need arises. The composition of the BoT involves local community representatives and all Chairpersons of the various Advisory Committees are invited to the Board meetings as in-attendance members where they can present matters arising from their respective Advisory Committees | Same comment as above. |
| 4. Adoption of a Sustainable Financing Strategy with policies & mechanisms that build long-term financial sustainability | Development of a sustainable financing strategy with policies and mechanisms that will build long term financial sustainability is a currently on-going process. To date, some of the key sources of financing such as tourism and gas have been identified but the necessary legal, technical | The Indicator seeks the <u>adoption</u> of a strategy and as such it has therefore not been achieved, even if progress has been made towards it. |

**Tanzania Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Project (MBREMP) :
TERMINAL EVALUATION**

| | and governance mechanisms to leverage these are as yet to be further researched, refined and implemented. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|---------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-----|----|----|------------|-----|-----|---|--------------|-----|-----|----|----------------|---|-----|-----|------------|-----|-----|-----|----------------|----|-----|---|--|
| 5. At least 30% of all key marine habitats are shown to have complete protection from extractive use by the end of the project | <p>Currently the following proportions of the main marine habitats are afforded either full or partial protection through their inclusion within the Zones as per the Zoning Plan.</p> <table> <tr> <th></th> <th>CZ</th> <th>SUZ</th> <th>Proposed CZ</th> </tr> <tr> <td>Corals:</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fringing Reefs: Seaward</td> <td>15%</td> <td>5%</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bay/Lagoon</td> <td>35%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Patch Reefs:</td> <td>15%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Channel Reefs:</td> <td>-</td> <td>40%</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mangroves:</td> <td>30%</td> <td>55%</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Seagrass Beds:</td> <td>5%</td> <td>10%</td> <td>-</td> </tr> </table> <p>Where: CZ = Core Zone (No Take – Total Protection) SUZ = Specified Use Zone (Regulated use by local resident communities)</p> <p>The Proposed Core Zones referred to above, will be implemented following further community and other stakeholder consultations and approval.</p> <p>To date the demarcation process is not completed as planned (needs specialised equipment and technology)</p> | | CZ | SUZ | Proposed CZ | Corals: | | | | Fringing Reefs: Seaward | 15% | 5% | 5% | Bay/Lagoon | 35% | 50% | - | Patch Reefs: | 15% | 25% | 5% | Channel Reefs: | - | 40% | 60% | Mangroves: | 30% | 55% | 10% | Seagrass Beds: | 5% | 10% | - | <p>The Indicator was very ambitious and in spite of the progress indicated by the PMU, it has not been met strictly speaking. On the other hand, the figures are good for the bay/lagoon, the channel reefs and the mangroves environments. The fringing reefs and seagrass beds require much more work.</p> |
| | CZ | SUZ | Proposed CZ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Corals: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fringing Reefs: Seaward | 15% | 5% | 5% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bay/Lagoon | 35% | 50% | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Patch Reefs: | 15% | 25% | 5% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Channel Reefs: | - | 40% | 60% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mangroves: | 30% | 55% | 10% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Seagrass Beds: | 5% | 10% | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

The ultimate end of the Development Objective adopted by the project was: to protect effectively, and to utilize sustainably. As these targets are difficult, if not impossible, to measure, the above Indicators were selected. However, the Team does not find the Indicators very informative. In fact, most are almost irrelevant to the Development Objective and only Indicator 5 comes close to indicating whether protection is taking place, even though it does not say much about effectiveness.

The Team cannot rate progress towards the Development Objective by looking at the Indicators as they do not match the Objective. However, we are aware of the work that has been achieved by the PMU and we consider it to be **satisfactory**.

4.1.2 Immediate Objectives/Outcomes/Results

The difficulties created by the inconsistent terminology within the ProDoc and through other aspects of the project have been discussed elsewhere in this report and in its attempt to evaluate/assess progress, the Team has focused on the six Outcomes that appear more or less consistently in the PIRs. To begin with, the Team invited the PMU to report on progress achieved by the project on each of the six Outcomes and the response is recorded in Table 6 below which provides a summary of the situation and which also contains the comments of the Team.

As can be seen from the table, the Team comments start with an examination of the Indicators themselves as selected for the Outcome. They then make reference to the assessment of progress made by the PMU and finish by assigning a rating on the progress achieved.

Only Outcome 1 has a set of relevant and useful Indicators – the rest range from inappropriate to inadequate to unnecessary. The Team believes that these Indicators were not very helpful to the PMU. In spite of this hurdle, the PMU persevered and completed the table, giving the Team a basis for rating the progress made towards the Outcomes.

Out of six Outcomes, progress has been satisfactory with three and another three have been assigned a rating of marginally satisfactory. Outcomes which have been given **satisfactory** ratings are:

- Outcome 1: Knowledge base
- Outcome 3: Planning and Monitoring
- Outcome 5: Capacity building

The satisfactory rating towards these Outcomes is very reassuring since they are among the key elements for the successful establishment of the Marine Park. Between them they provide the foundation (knowledge base) on which the Park is built, the ability to manage it (capacity) and the means for measuring success and identifying worrying trends (monitoring).

The Outcomes that were rated as **marginally satisfactory** are:

Outcome 2: Awareness

Outcome 4: Management Plan

Outcome 6: Alternative Income

These too are key ingredients for an effective Marine Park and their slightly lower rating is primarily a reflection of “work in progress”. Progress has indeed been achieved towards these Outcomes as well, but more work needs to be done.

Table 6. Achievement of project Outcomes

| PROJECT OUTCOMES | INDICATOR | PROGRESS ACHIEVED ACCORDING TO THE PROJECT MANAGEMENT UNIT | COMMENTS OF THE EVALUATION TEAM |
|---|--|---|---|
| Outcome 1: Knowledge base to support marine environmental planning and sustainable development established | Baseline of comprehensive and detailed biological (including biodiversity) and socio-economic data from MBREMP available | The Project expended considerable resources in establishing comprehensive and detailed baseline information on marine resources, biodiversity and socio-economic / livelihood aspects of this newly gazetted Marine Park. All data related to and reports from these studies are available at MBREMP | <p>The Indicators selected for this Outcome are considered quite appropriate. They are helpful in gauging the progress towards the Outcome which, according to the PMU, has been significant.</p> <p>The Team concurs with the assessment of the PMU and rates progress towards this Outcome as having been satisfactory.</p> |
| | Baseline biological and socio-economic data used to develop the General Management Plan | Baseline biological and socio-economic data together with indigenous knowledge were used to develop the MBREMP General Management Plan. These assessments (8 in total) have been published and circulated to various stakeholders. These included 5 Biological surveys and 3 Socio-economic assessments. | |
| | Baseline biological and socio-economic survey data used to assess sustainable use levels of key current and potential marine resources | Baseline biological and socio-economic survey data laid a strong baseline for assessment of sustainable use levels of key current/future and potential marine resources based on on-going monitoring and trend changes. The nature of certain of the target species for some of the fisheries (i.e. the off-shore fishery of seasonal migratory species) will require either further local research or the use of extrapolation from wider, national or regional assessments of the resource stock. | |
| | Patrol reports, licensing & user fee data is entered into the database and used for reporting and management decision making | Currently, patrol reports, licensing and user fee data is entered into the MOMS forms (MOMS being the adopted monitoring system) used for reporting and management decision making after analysis | |
| | Mtwara District & District and Urban Councils & Marine Park integrate work plans and activities | Integration of work plans and activities between the Marine Park, Mtwara District and municipal councils is done wherever possible to avoid duplication of effort and to maximize the use of available resources. | |
| Outcome 2: Local communities and key decision makers are aware of marine problems, benefits and responsibilities of an MPA and use the information in decision making | High level of awareness of marine park boundaries, zones and regulations in adult residents of MBREMP and marine resource user groups in and adjacent communities including Mtwara town. | At present there is a high level of awareness of Marine Park's boundaries, zones and regulations among the various stakeholders of MBREMP as they were involved in the development process of zoning plan, the GMP and the regulations. The physical marking of these boundaries on the ground and the sea is still necessary to reinforce this and to avoid possible enforcement conflicts. This is currently being delayed due to a review of some minor discrepancies in the Park Boundary definition and to the technicalities of marking the off-shore boundaries given the nature of the bathymetry of the area. | <p>The Outcome targeted awareness and use of information. The Indicators selected are relevant to the Outcome but they do not provide a complete picture. For example, there is a need for an Indicator of the degree of awareness, as well as another Indicator of how communities and decision-makers are using the information.</p> <p>But even if the given Indicators are considered, the PMU itself accepts that more work needs to be done. The Team recognizes that communities and decision-makers have enhanced awareness as a result of the project, however, is uncertain as to the extent that they are using this information. As a result, progress towards this Outcome is rated as marginally satisfactory.</p> |
| | Key local decision makers support MBREMP staff in sustainable fisheries management and biodiversity conservation | Most of local decision makers are very positive to the MBREMP and are supporting the presence of the Park and its objectives including sustainable fisheries management and biodiversity conservation. This is being achieved through lobbying support from local community members and enhancement of the collaborative management approach | |
| Outcome 3: Marine park planning and monitoring | Draft General Management Plan produced | General Management plan produced, endorsed by the Minister for Natural Resources and Tourism and now in place and being implemented | <p>The Indicators selected for this Outcome are unnecessary since the Outcome targets two tangible products and there is not need for indicators to know whether they have been produced or not.</p> |
| | Long term monitoring programme of environmental and socioeconomic | MOMS adopted and various initial modules designed based on the identified needs for monitoring. Implementation is on-going and further modules will be designed and added as the capacity of the staff and community stake-holders increases or as the | |

Tanzania Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Project (MBREMP) : TERMINAL EVALUATION

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| processes established and an initial marine park management plan developed | parameters designed and implemented | management needs arise. | The Team agrees with the assessment of the PMU and finds progress towards this Outcome as having been satisfactory . |
| Outcome 4: Park Management Plan under implementation with externalities addressed | Resource users (fishers, mangrove harvesters, tourism and other developers...) observe the MP zoning plan Marine resource status improved | Resource users are aware of, and are guided by the principle of the zoning plan as a management tool of multiple use marine protected areas; as it harmonizes conflicting conservation and livelihood objectives. MBREMP resource users have a wide range of clarity and predictability. Too early to notice significant changes. However, some resource users declare a perceived improvement especially when comparing the current against past fish catches (subjective information). In most instances the objective data collection programmes are as yet of too short a duration to show meaningful trends. As for the biological data collection programme mentioned above it is still too early to notice any meaningful changes | The Outcome is generally clear, even though it is silent on what externalities are to be addressed. However, it is not easy to ascertain whether and to what extent, a Plan comprising 66 different management strategies is being implemented. As a result, the Indicators selected are not representative of the scope of the Plan and do not provide a useful picture of progress. Taking the given Indicators, the PMU does not provide a picture of progress and the Team rates progress towards this Outcome as having been marginally satisfactory . |
| Outcome 5: Improved capacity of key stakeholders and institutions for marine conservation and management | Effective conservation and coastal resource management institutions operating in MBREMP, led by MP staff and key stakeholders Resident stakeholders complying with MP regulations Law enforcement and increasing of awareness to the Park dwellers reduced illegal events within the Park area. Suitable AIGs for MBREMP resident stakeholders identified | At present Government and Non Government Institutions operating in MBREMP are pro-conservation as they implement their activities with a high degree of caution in order to comply with the existing legislation and regulations and they are aware that Park legislation supersedes others with the Park area. In case of anything that seems to be controversial, the Park management is consulted prior to its undertaking nor implementation Currently compliance levels are higher among resident stakeholders than previously, they report immediately to the relevant authorities whenever there are issues or actions of non compliance Law enforcement and increasing of awareness to the Park and adjacent area dwellers has to a great extent reduced illegal activities and/or events in the Park area. However, compliance has much thought. Suitable AIGs where identified from a targeted consultancy, and this list has been refined after piloting a number of the original options. The process of developing value chains and suitable business plans for the more suitable and successful options projects is now underway | The Indicators selected for this Outcome are a mixture – the first one needs indicators of its own since it is difficult to measure; the second and third can be measured but may not be depicting the Outcome (improved capacity); the fourth Indicator is out of place and relates more to the next Outcome. The PMU response is caught by the inappropriate Indicators and does not help with assessing progress towards the Outcome. On this basis, the Team should rate this as unsatisfactory, however, our understanding of the real situation leads us to rate progress towards this Outcome as satisfactory . |
| Outcome 6: AIG and sustainable resource use activities are researched, redeveloped, piloted and adopted | A decrease in the number of marine resource dependent households and the well being of marine resource dependent households improved | As mentioned above a number of diversified income generating activities were identified and pilot programmes implemented, these activities can potentially cause a diversification of livelihood activities, away from those solely related to harvesting of marine resources. It is still too early for a suitable or significant decrease in the number of marine resource dependant households or a respective improvement in their well-being to be seen. There is still an issue of traditional/cultural beliefs, practices and perceptions based on these to be fully addressed and overcome. | The Outcome targets simply the establishment of AIGs. The Indicator goes beyond the Outcome and says nothing about research, development, piloting and adoption of AIGs. The PMU response does indicate that research was conducted, and that piloting is taking place. However, more work needs to be done before the AIGs can be said to have been adopted. The Team sees progress towards this Outcome as marginally satisfactory . |

The project has carried out virtually all the planned activities and made significant progress towards all the targeted Outcomes. It needs to be recognized that as a result of the type of project – the Marine Park exists, and will continue – many of the activities are “open-ended”. It is therefore more appropriate to measure progress by the distance from the baseline rather than the distance towards an objective.

On this basis, the Team believes that the progress attained by the project has been significant and **satisfactory** over all.

4.2 Project impacts

4.2.1 Global environmental impacts

The ProDoc is modest in its discussion of the ecosystems, biodiversity and ecosystem services provided by MBREMP, and which are of global significance. It makes reference to “*globally significant marine biodiversity values*” and “*this complex system of coral reefs, mangroves, sea-grasses and other ecosystems (which) is amongst the least disturbed on Tanzania’s coast, but under increasing stress*”. It also makes reference to the potential for “*initiating transboundary co-operation with Mozambique on marine environmental management*” and notes that “*Mozambique is developing a Marine Protected Area to the south of the Ruvuma River delta in the North Quirimba Islands*”. But it does not identify any comparative global values which would make this a prime site for GEF support because of the global benefits that will accrue from the project.

The STAP Review is not very helpful in this respect either, and neither is the Incremental Cost Analysis. The best discussion of ecosystem values and services is provided in Annex 9 of the ProDoc and in the Environmental Assessment Report. However, even this is not very explicit regarding the global dimension of the Mnazi Bay and Ruvuma Estuary ecosystem.

The Evaluation Team had to review the literature to note for example that WWF considers the Mtwara-Quirimbas Complex (Mnazi Bay, Ruvuma Delta and Quirimbas reefs to Pemba), as one of eight sites of global importance on the East African coast. It reaches this conclusion because:

- It is located where the South Equatorial Current meets the African coast
- It comprises extensive and complex reef systems with high coral diversity (>48 genera)
- It is an important turtle feeding and nursery site
- It is an important feeding area for Crab Plovers and migratory birds
- It contains the unique Ruvuma dunes system with the likelihood of rare or endemic flora.
- It is an important nursery area for Humpback whales

The above is borne out by Ruitenbeek *et. al.*¹³ who notes that the Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary is located where the South Equatorial Current meets the African mainland after crossing the Indian Ocean, and is thus the source point for the East African Coastal Current, and forms a critical node for the accumulation and dispersal of marine organisms for East Africa. Thus, the health of the reefs in the park are likely to be of critical importance to downstream areas in Tanzania and Kenya in the north and adjacent areas in Mozambique in the south. MBREMP ranks among the highest diversity sites for corals in East Africa, and very high levels of recruitment of hard and soft corals have been observed. It also provides nesting sites for endangered green and critically endangered hawksbill turtles; dolphins occur in the park throughout the year; sperm and humpback whales are seen during annual migrations; the mangroves of the Ruvuma Estuary appear to be among the best mangrove

¹³ Ruitenbeek, J, I Hewawasam and M Ngoile (2005) *Blueprint 2050 – Sustaining the Marine Environment in Mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar*. World Bank, Washington.

forests in Tanzania; and, the park is also classified as an Important Bird Area because of the high densities it supports of migrating crab plovers.

In the international and regional policy context, MBREMP supports the main objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD): the conservation of biodiversity, its sustainable use, and equitable sharing of benefits. More specifically it contributes to key elements of the Jakarta Mandate, which focuses *inter alia* on integrated marine and coastal area management, the sustainable use of living resources, and marine and coastal protected areas. In addition, the project also contributes to the Convention for the Protection, Management and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Eastern African Region (the Nairobi Convention). Article 10 of the Convention focuses on protecting fragile marine ecosystems and threatened species and on establishing marine protected areas (MPAs).

Finally, as a result of the project, there is now the potential for a transboundary protected area. The Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park in Tanzania is contiguous with the Palma-Rouvuma Marine National Reserve in Mozambique and discussions on collaboration have been initiated by MBREMP.

4.2.2 National level impacts

The project has had a significant impact at the national level. It will leave behind the Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park as a very valuable legacy to the Government and people of Tanzania. The Park is a manifestation that conservation and development can both be achieved in a balanced manner within the same environment. It encompasses protected areas of high ecological value together with commercial gas extraction, some 30,000 villagers, and a growing tourism sector. The philosophy, approach and experience generated by the project for such a multi-purpose Park will be of benefit to Tanzania.

Capacity building has been one of the targets of the project and it has carried this out successfully. Capacity has been enhanced noticeably in the area of Park planning and management. It has also been enhanced through expertise for environment-friendly tourism planning and for managing the environmental impacts of the oil and gas industry.

In addition, the capacity of communities has been enhanced significantly to enable them to participate meaningfully in Park activities. In fact, the impressive level of community engagement achieved by the project is another element of its valuable legacy. However, the 30,000 villagers who live in the park have not only been mobilized to protect their environment – they have also been assisted through better management of their resources towards a more sustainable use of their traditional resources as well as in seeking alternative means of livelihood support. In other words, given time, the long term impact of the project at national level will include poverty alleviation and an improvement in the quality of life of the Park inhabitants.

5 FINDINGS: SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or programme after GEF and other assistance has come to an end. The Team is required to determine the prospects for sustainability on a number of dimensions of the project outcomes and rate them as follows:

Likely: There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability

Moderately Likely: There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability

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

Unlikely: There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability

5.1 Institutional sustainability

Institutional sustainability is virtually “guaranteed” through the Government’s ownership of the project product – the Marine Park which is established according to Government policy and underpinned by the necessary legislative and regulatory foundations. The MBREMP has a well established and effective organizational and administrative structure which is headed by the Board of Trustees for Marine Parks and Reserves which sets policy and provides direction and guidance. The Board has committed to meeting the personnel and long term operational costs of the MBREMP. There is also a Project Management Unit onsite in Mtwara with qualified core and supporting staff together with the Advisory Board with expertise ranging from community issues to technical matters. The development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc) by the project, has been successful.

MBREMP has been developed through the experience acquired in the development of the first marine park in Tanzania, the Mafia Island Marine Park and the institutional arrangements adopted at Mafia have been refined and applied to MBREMP.

The Evaluation Team is confident that the institutional sustainability of MBREMP is **very likely**.

5.2 Financial sustainability

In spite of efforts which are still on-going, the financial sustainability of the Park is not yet thought by the Team to be secure, even though the prospects are very good.

Core funding for staff salaries is allocated from the Government central budget and this is considered to be very likely to continue. However, operational costs are significant and additional funds will need to be found, at least in the short term. Some degree of Government funding in addition to salaries is expected in view of the national obligations to meet the requirements of various conventions, treaties and other agreements. It is also a well-known fact that few, if any, Marine Protected Areas in the world are totally self-sufficient in terms of financing and Government needs to see financial support to MBREMP as in the national interest. It should also be noted that the main objectives and core functions of PAs are not revenue generation, even though the broader values of PAs (e.g. conserving and allowing sustainable access to a wide variety of natural resource goods and services) need also to be considered when looking at the “returns/revenues” generated from multi-purpose, participatory Protected Areas.

The PMU has identified two main sources of external funding. The first of these is tourism development which is still in its infancy and which has great potential. Income to the Park can be derived from entry fees, concession fees from developers and hoteliers, and resource user fees. The fact that tourism is within the same portfolio as natural resources which is the area that Marine Parks fall under in the government structure, is a bonus.

The second source of income is the natural gas sector and other hydrocarbon extraction activities. Income could be derived from licensing fees/royalties, compensation to the Park for staff inputs/time and any other cost related to advice, cost recovery for monitoring of the gas production project, compensation for any disruption/destruction of environment caused by gas exploitation activities. The PMU has established a very effective relationship with the company managing the extraction facility and negotiations on the above sources of funding are underway. However, since the Government is the main shareholder of the Gas Project Development company through TPDC, the discussions related to such fees need to be discussed and allocated at inter-ministerial level.

A third potential source of income for the Marine Park is through the sale of certified CO₂ emission reductions (CERs), also known as the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). This is an incentive

created under the Kyoto Protocol for projects which reduce greenhouse gas emissions in developing countries. Artumas, the gas production company operating in the Marine Park, is one such project and since it is operating within the Park area, a certain proportion of the benefits from such sales should be ploughed back into the support of implementation of conservation activities.

The identification of these and other potential sources of funding support for the Marine Park augur well for its financial sustainability. However, there is a need for a Financial Sustainability Strategy for the Park to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends. The Strategy needs to determine - how much the Park costs today; how much income does it generate; how much does the Government contribute; how much is needed from external sources; how much is likely to be provided from external sources; and, what sources have been identified?

In view of the work that still needs to be done towards financial sustainability for the Park, the Team rates financial sustainability as **moderately likely**.

5.3 Knowledge management

The project has produced an extensive cache of data, information and knowledge and Annex 7 contains a list of key publications of the project including technical documents, leaflets, posters and other educational material. This has added to the growing information base on marine biodiversity, ecosystem health, resource use, and socio-economic parameters that has already been collected in Mnazi Bay through the activities of the Institute of Marine Science, Frontier Tanzania, TCMP and various consultancies. Such a wealth of knowledge must be safeguarded. It needs to be collated and properly archived and kept in an accessible format.

The project does not have its own website even though it is featured on the MPRU website; and its GIS database is still under consideration. Although it is still in temporary premises, the project does have a reference library and the Team was advised of the plans for an information centre which will be part of the Marine Park HQ which has been designed under the project (through the FFEM support) and which will be built in the coming months.

It is essential that the project prepare the way for the creation of the information centre by ensuring that its knowledge base is well organized and archived and able to be accessed by all those who need it. Apart from Park personnel, this could include other officials working in the Park, personnel from other projects, the private sector and community members especially those involved with the Park such as monitors and students involved in survey and monitoring. Work towards this aim should be carried out as part of the exit strategy.

In terms of the knowledge generated by the project, the Team believes that its sustainability is **moderately likely** – while the chances are good, some risk remains.

5.4 Exit strategy

Although the UNDP/GEF funding support is coming to an end, this is not really an exit, but a metamorphosis, and the Marine Park will continue. However, any incomplete activities should be brought to completion to the extent possible, and the project close-down should be well planned and managed. This will safeguard the various gains made by the project such as institutional as well as human capacity, which need to be safeguarded by an effective exit strategy which aims for:

- a structured close-down of the UNDP/GEF project
- a managed handing-over
- a rational allocation of assets with recognition and receipts

- an exchange of appreciation and commitment letters
- more work on the financial sustainability strategy
- an effective knowledge management system
- a more inclusive approach to communities – with meaningful participation

The exit strategy must also address the follow-up and replication activities which are discussed further below

The Team is heartened by the efforts discussed by the PMU for the development of a sound exit strategy, however, as this still needs to be finalized, and as time is fast running out, we rate the exit strategy as **moderately likely**.

5.5 Replicability

The Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park built on the experience provided by the Mafia Marine Park which was the first in Tanzania. However, some challenges were new and the experience gained through the establishment and operation of MBREMP, will serve in good stead in the establishment of any further marine parks in Tanzania. Marine Parks are a core component of the overall Tanzania Coastal Management Partnership (TCMP) approach and the involvement of TCMP in this Project has ensured that the experience of the Mnazi Bay Marine Park will be available within the wider context of ICM.

The MBREMP Project supported by UNDP/GEF and FFEM has already led to a follow-up project. It is the WWF Project in Mtwara which says it is a follow-up on the UNDP/GEF Project. It adopted the same Goal as the MBREMP project and set out to consolidate the participatory elements of the VEMPs, raise awareness, improve livelihoods and access to social services, and continue with monitoring, data collection and information gathering. Plans for close collaboration with this project should be drawn up as part of the MBREMP exit strategy.

It must also be noted that Mozambique has proclaimed a Marine Protected Area to the south of the Ruvuma River delta in the North Quirimba Islands¹⁴, the Palma-Rouvuma Marine National Reserve. The MBREMP experience can be shared through transboundary cooperation with Mozambique, and a transboundary protected area system could eventuate. This will serve as a model for the Western Indian Ocean as a whole.

5.6 Follow-up

This is an operational Marine Park and work started by the project is on-going and open-ended and prospects are very good for the Park to become self-sustaining in the not too distant future. However, the time frame for project delivery failed to take into account the amount of time required for traditional people to transform their way of life, to change their behaviour and to adopt different approaches to coastal and marine resources. These significant changes come slowly – only after Park personnel have gained the respect and credibility of the villagers – and this takes time. Despite the significant progress made during the original project period, the Marine Park needs more time for consolidation. In the short term there is a need for further support to consolidate the investments made by the project in communities engagement, to refine the monitoring strategy and to develop the financial sustainability strategy.

¹⁴ This is part of a GEF supported project in Mozambique (MICOA / WB) for ICZM. Project development in Tanzania is in touch with the Mozambique process, directly, and via the Mtwara Corridor activity.

The Team heard much about the unspent FFEM funds that remain and that in spite of this, FFEM plans to wind down its support at the end of December 2007. In its brief discussions with FFEM officials, the Team was advised that this decision, which could still be reconsidered, was reached through frustration and disappointment and that it was *“an administrative decision imposed by the way the project has been run”*. FFEM reported that there has not been sufficient feedback from the project and it feels completely out of touch. It is also of the opinion that funds were mismanaged during Phase One and the matter has not been resolved. It would seem that documentation which regularly updates partners on project activities and progress, which is alleged to have been sent to FFEM by UNDP, may not have arrived or has not been recorded as received.

FFEM has provided a list of outstanding items to UNDP and MPRU and plans an evaluation of the project (together with other projects in the region) in late January 2008. The list of outstanding items, as shared by FFEM with the Team comprises:

- *6th PSC Minutes: draft minutes were proposed by the project team on Feb 13th, 2007. We proposed some amendment on March the 1st, 2007 and were, to our knowledge, the only one to do so. We didn't have any feed back after that*
- *2007 work program : the work program was still being discussed in March 2007; to our knowledge, the PSC has not approved a final version*
- *Reporting : we only received a draft 2006-2007 PIR report from Dave Reynolds on September 18th, 2007; no quarterly report and monitoring reporting by the project team was send to us*
- *Financial report: we didn't receive any financial reports on FFEM funds since 2006*
- *FFEM extension in 2008: we proposed an amended financial agreement on March the 16th, 2007; we didn't get any feed back*
- *a list of expenses, detailing for each line the number of the contract concerned, the date and the amount of the expenses*
- *copies of the invoices for expenses above 10 000*
- *copies of the contracts for contracts above 30 000*

Some of the outstanding items have since been supplied and if these are satisfactory, and depending on the outcome of the evaluation, it is possible that FFEM will reconsider its decision to end its funding support.

The Evaluation Team commends such an extension at no extra cost, to FFEM.

The Evaluation Team also recommends to UNDP to assist the Government to identify other sources of funding support.

The Evaluation Team further recommends to the Marine Park that in any extension/follow-up period, the focus should be on:

- Community engagement (various activities ranging from AIGs to the gear exchange programme, Honorary Wardens System and other forms of meaningful participation)
- Refinement of the Monitoring Strategy allowing for different types of monitoring with different objectives and addressing the management of data and information that arise from the monitoring activity as well as the actions that will be precipitated by the emerging results and trends
- Development and implementation of a Financial Sustainability Strategy including identification of potential sources of funding and the development of mechanisms through which these sources can be utilized.

The PMU shared their plans for an extension period / follow-up, with the Team and these are attached in Annex 8. In addition to the above three areas of work recommended by the Team, the PMU also wishes to work with colleagues across the border in Mozambique towards the development of a trans-boundary MPA. While the Team finds this work laudable, it believes that consolidation of the MBREMP to ensure its sustainability is the highest priority.

6 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions have been reached and recommendations made throughout this report. They are gathered here, focussed and augmented as necessary for ease of action.

6.1 Project concept and design

The project concept was basically sound and the project design was also fine in principle. The Evaluation Team believes that the approach inherent in the project design is an effective means of achieving the objectives. In particular, the emphasis on community activities, ranging from awareness-raising to alternative income generating activities, is seen as a very sound approach. However, the ProDoc lacked quality control, used terminology loosely and was not very helpful to project management. The project design was appropriate for the set objectives, however, the implementation arrangements were somewhat unwieldy and the division into two phases with responsibilities entrusted to a different organization was a design fault.

6.2 Project governance

The Project Steering Committee provided guidance and direction to the project but this was not recognized by all. Some felt that its work was being pre-empted by the “Partners Group” but this was not found to be correct. The Marine Park Advisory Committee (which was composed mainly from local people) was a good source of guidance, complementing the PSC. We recommend to UNDP and GEF that the role and function played by PSCs in project governance should be examined and that they should consider developing guidelines for the setting up and operational procedures of PSCs.

6.3 Project implementation and management

Project management was generally effective in both phases but suffered through the hiatus created between the two phases. In addition, there seems to have been two “managers” with overlapping responsibilities and unclear roles separation during the First Phase and this did affect project delivery. The unclear distinction and relativity between the roles of PM and TA are a recurring problem in UN projects and we recommend against this sort of model in future.

The Team recommends that when a phased project is designed in future, there should not be a change in implementing agency and, if this is unavoidable, there needs to be a strategy to ensure an orderly hand-over of project management responsibilities.

The Evaluation Team recommends to UNDP and IUCN, to discontinue the use of the term Technical Advisor when in fact the position is one of Project Manager. The term should be reserved for those who provide technical advice and support, not those expected to manage the project

6.4 Achievement of targeted outputs and objectives

The Team could not rate progress towards the Development Objective by looking at the Indicators as they do not match the Objective. However, we are aware of the work that has been achieved by the PMU and we consider it to be **satisfactory**.

Progress towards Outcome 1 (Knowledge base) has been **satisfactory** with an adequate technical base established for Park management. More work is required especially on the social dimension.

Progress towards Outcome 2 (Awareness) has been **marginally satisfactory** and more work is required and not only in Nalingu Village.

Progress towards Outcome 3 (Planning and Monitoring) has been **satisfactory** in terms of both planning and monitoring even though the latter requires some more work.

Progress towards Outcome 4 ((Management Plan) is considered **marginally satisfactory** even though the Plan has been prepared. This rating is the result of the Indicators selected and the extent of project progress towards them.

Progress towards Outcome 5 (Capacity) has been **satisfactory**. On the basis of the Indicators, this Outcome should be rated as unsatisfactory, however, our understanding of the real situation leads us to assign the satisfactory rating.

Progress towards Outcome 6 (Alternative Incomes) is considered **marginally satisfactory** and more work is required particularly at the commercial end of the operations.

Only Outcome 1 has a set of relevant and useful Indicators – the rest range from inappropriate to inadequate to unnecessary. The Team believes that these Indicators were not very helpful to the PMU and recommends greater attention to Indicators in future project planning

The project has carried out virtually all the planned activities and made significant progress towards all the targeted Outcomes. It needs to be recognized that as a result of the type of project – the Marine Park exists, and will continue – many of the activities are “open-ended”. It is therefore more appropriate to measure progress by the distance from the baseline rather than the distance towards an objective.

On this basis, the Team believes that the progress attained by the project has been significant and **satisfactory over all**.

6.5 Project monitoring and evaluation

The project did not have an M&E Plan and monitoring was weak in some respects such as project performance for adaptive management using the LogFrame and the quality of the LogFrame did not help. However, the extent of monitoring undertaken by the project satisfies the requirements of UNDP and GEF. In addition, the Team is aware that the project was audited annually. Some aspects of monitoring were substantial, and the involvement of communities in monitoring activities, is laudable.

The project has definitely put in place a portfolio of monitoring activities and given time, this will become a valuable management asset. The only improvement that can be recommended is the adoption of a comprehensive M&E Plan to provide the framework and cohesion. The Team feels that monitoring activities by the project can be rated as **satisfactory** overall but any extension or follow-up should be contingent on a well-structured Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.

The Team considers the quality of the LogFrame and its use as a tool for project management to have been **moderately satisfactory**.

The Team found compliance monitoring to be **moderately satisfactory** while the involvement of communities in monitoring activities is deemed to have been **satisfactory**.

The rating for ecosystem monitoring is **moderately satisfactory** because it is still being developed and this recognizes its future potential.

The PMU used a tool for monitoring management effectiveness which was in effect a version of the METT. The Team concurs with the assessments of the situation and the scores awarded by the PMU. However, there are some slight differences of opinion and while the final result is not too different, the Team has scored the MBREMP slightly lower than the PMU.

6.6 Financial management

The involvement of too many layers made financial management somewhat complex during Phase One. However, in both phases, finances were adequately managed, there was no obvious waste and no extravagance, and value for money has been achieved. This was in spite of financial planning, as evidenced by the ProDoc, being fraught with inconsistent amounts and confusion.

In the opinion of the Team, and when comparing it with similar projects elsewhere, the budget allocated to this project was adequate and not excessive. What led to the unspent balance of FFEM funds at the end of the UNDP/GEF project, was the lack of time available to carry out the planned activities which resulted from the delays experienced during the transition between Phase One and Phase Two.

Throughout the project, the Government provided core funding to cover salaries and some of the operational costs for the establishment and operations of MBREMP. This funding support was even more significant during the Second Phase when Park personnel, funded by the Government, served as the Project Management Unit, and only the Technical Advisor was funded from GEF/FFEM sources.

The Evaluation Team notes that many problems encountered during the First Phase did not occur during the Second Phase when the disbursement was made directly by UNDP to the Marine Park Unit / Project Management Unit, through the MPRU, according to the NEX modality. In contracting an international organization to serve as implementing agency for a project, thus introducing an additional administrative layer, the Government and UNDP need to balance these risks with the benefits that such an arrangement is expected to bring to the project.

The team traced the direct co-financing to the extent possible and was able to ascertain that the greater part of the funds had been raised. The sum of US\$713,800 that had been committed as direct co-financing, was increased to US\$943,800 through the increased funding from FFEM¹⁵. The Team was able to ascertain that of this, US\$845,800 had indeed been raised, but could not verify the status of the remaining US\$98,000. However, out of the funds that had been raised through co-financing, the project was able to use only US\$645,800, and US\$200,000 may be reabsorbed.

6.7 Stakeholder participation, community empowerment

The degree of stakeholder participation, both at Government level and at grassroots level, was exemplary. However, there is some room for improvement in the way that communities are approached and brought on board. We recommend that field staff, even technical personnel, should be provided with training, to empower them with the methodologies to approach community members more sensitively in the future.

6.8 Capacity building and other project impacts

The capacity for Park planning and management has been enhanced significantly by the project. It is also worth noting that given time, initiatives put in place by the project could assist with poverty

¹⁵ For budgeting purposes it was agreed that the FFEM funds which were in Euros would be considered as equivalent to US Dollars on a one-to-one basis.

alleviation among disadvantaged communities. Furthermore, capacity for environment-friendly tourism planning and for managing the environmental impacts of the oil and gas industry, have also been enhanced substantially.

From a global perspective, the project impacts are intrinsic to the geographical site – any positive outcomes achieved in the Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary, are of global significance simply because of the high biodiversity values of the location. It also needs to be stressed that MBREMP has a further global dimension in that it is contiguous with the Palma-Rouvuma Marine National Reserve in Mozambique and discussions on collaboration have already been initiated by MBREMP.

6.9 Sustainability

Institutional sustainability is “guaranteed” by the Government’s ownership of the project product – the Marine Park and the Evaluation Team is confident in rating the institutional sustainability of MBREMP as **very likely**.

Financial sustainability is not yet secure, even though prospects are very good. The identification of a number of potential sources of funding support for the Marine Park augurs well for its financial sustainability. However, there is a need for a Financial Sustainability Strategy for the Park to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends.

In view of the work that still needs to be done towards financial sustainability for the Park, the Team rates financial sustainability as **moderately likely** and we recommend that a Financial Sustainability Strategy should be developed right away.

6.10 Knowledge management

It is essential that the project prepare the way for the creation of the information centre planned for the new Park HQ by ensuring that its knowledge base is well organized and archived and able to be accessed by all those who need it.

In terms of the knowledge generated by the project, the Team believes that its sustainability is **moderately likely** – while the chances are good, some risk remains.

6.11 Exit strategy

Although the UNDP/GEF funding support is to end, this is not really an exit, but a metamorphosis and the Park will continue. However, any incomplete activities should be brought to completion to the extent possible, and the project close-down should be well planned and managed.

The Team is heartened by the efforts of the PMU for the development of a sound exit strategy, however, as this still needs to be finalized, and as time is fast running out, we rate the exit strategy as **moderately likely**.

6.12 Replicability

The Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park built on the experience provided by the Mafia Marine Park which was the first in Tanzania. However, some challenges were new and the experience gained through the establishment and operation of MBREMP, will serve in good stead in the establishment of any further marine parks in Tanzania.

It must also be noted that Mozambique is developing a Marine Protected Area to the south of the Ruvuma River delta in the North Quirimba Islands¹⁶. The MBREMP experience can be shared through transboundary cooperation with Mozambique, and a transboundary protected area system could eventuate. This will serve as a model for the Western Indian Ocean as a whole.

6.13 Follow-up

This is an operational Marine Park, and the work started by the project is on-going and open-ended. The prospects are very good for the Park to become self-sustaining in the not too distant future, but until this eventuality, there is a need for further support to consolidate the gains made by the project. In the short term there is a need for further support to consolidate the investments made by the project in communities' engagement, to refine the monitoring strategy and to develop the financial sustainability strategy. This support could be in the form of an extension of time without extra cost of the FFEM support.

FFEM has provided a list of outstanding items to UNDP and MPRU and plans an evaluation of the project in late January 2008. Some of the outstanding items have since been supplied and if these are satisfactory, and depending on the outcome of the evaluation, it is possible that FFEM will reconsider its decision to end its funding support. The Evaluation Team recommends to FFEM to consider such an extension to the project delivery time at no extra cost.

We also recommend to UNDP that it provides support and advice to the Government for the identification of further financial support to enable this outstanding work to be carried out.

The Evaluation Team further recommends to the Marine Park that in any extension/follow-up period, the focus should be on:

- Community engagement (various activities ranging from AIGs to the gear exchange programme, Honorary Wardens System and other forms of meaningful participation)
- Refinement of the Monitoring Strategy allowing for different types of monitoring with different objectives and addressing the management of data and information that arise from the monitoring activity as well as the actions that will be precipitated by the emerging results and trends
- Development and implementation of a Financial Sustainability Strategy including identification of potential sources of funding and the development of mechanisms through which these sources can be utilized.

6.14 Experience gained and lessons learnt

The project has genuinely strived to provide avenues for **community participation**, however, its efforts did not always create the envisaged results, at least not in the early stages of the project. The lesson from this is that it takes time, maybe a long time, to encourage and convince people to change the way of life that they have practiced for generations – projects that rely on the good will and collaboration of communities need to allow adequate time for confidence to be built and credibility to be established before they can expect results.

In an effort to build capacity in the First Phase and then enhance that capacity through operational responsibility, the project was designed in **two Phases** and entrusted to two different actors. In hindsight this was not a good model and the project suffered because of the problems of transition. The lesson is that before such a model is applied again, the project proponents need to weigh and balance the benefits of such an approach, with the risks which appear inevitable.

¹⁶ This is part of a GEF supported project in Mozambique (MICOA / WB) for ICZM. Project development in Tanzania is in touch with the Mozambique process, directly, and via the Mtwara Corridor activity.

Alternative Income Generation activities are a recognized way of easing the pressure on natural resources without penalizing communities that have depended on them. But in order to maintain credibility in the eyes of the communities, these activities must be successful. The lesson is that all AIGs must be worked through thoroughly and before they are applied, because no AIG is a lesser evil than a failed AIG.

The Park is going to depend on sustainable financial support sources for its continued effective operation and the **Sustainable Financing Strategy** is still being developed and negotiations are still ongoing, a few weeks from project closure, with the risk that time will run out before a robust strategy has been developed. The lesson is that such an essential element for sustainability must be finalized early in the project life so that it can be tried out, refined and adopted well before the Park becomes reliant on it.

ANNEX 1 EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

PROJECT SUMMARY

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Project Title: | Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park |
| Project Number: | 00015405 former URT/00G31/B/1G/99 |
| Focal Area: | Conservation of Biological Biodiversity |
| GEF Strategic Priority: | SP1 Protected Areas |
| Country: | United Republic of Tanzania |
| Duration: | 54 Months |
| GEF Agency: | UNDP |
| Executing Agency: | GOT, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism |
| Implementing Agencies: | The Board of Trustees for Marine Parks & Reserves Unit IUCN-The World Conservation Union (initial set up phase, now completed) |
| Budget: | UNDP/GEF: \$1,495,424 GOT (in-kind): \$215,800 IUCN: \$42,000 Communities: \$56,000 FFEM: EUR 630,000 |
| Approval Date: | 01 March, 2002 |
| Effective Date: | July 2002 |
| Primary Beneficiaries: | Environment |
| Secondary Beneficiaries: | Local communities |
| DCAS Sector/Subsector: | Natural Resources |
| ACC Sector/Sub-sector: | Biological Resources |

Project Summary

The development of Mnazi Bay Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Project provides the additional funding (support) for the development of a multi-purpose Marine Protected Area (MPA) around the globally significant marine biodiversity values of the Mnazi Bay and Ruvuma Estuary areas in southern Tanzania. This is Tanzania's second Marine Park. In keeping with Marine Park philosophy in Tanzania, the sustainable use of marine resources by communities, as well as biodiversity conservation is emphasized. The project is designed as a 54-month (two phased) project, including an initial participatory planning phase followed by an implementation phase. There is a focus on protected area zoning with sustainable harvesting. Externalities are addressed

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The GEF, and later with the FFEM, provided funding for the Mnazi Bay Project. In keeping with the Tanzania Marine Parks and Reserves Act, both biodiversity conservation and the sustainable use of marine resources by local communities are emphasized. The project was designed to run for 54 months, in two phases. The first phase was concluded in October 2004 whereby a mid-term evaluation was conducted to enable all parties to assess progress, and agree on specific administrative and implementation responsibilities for the second Implementation Phase. This GEF / UNDP and later FFEM project operates under the auspices of Tanzania's Marine Parks and Reserves Unit (MPRU), implemented in the first phase by the East Africa Regional Office (EARO) of IUCN and second phase implementation is by MBREMP staff and supervised by Government through MPRU.

2.0 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The UNDP/GEF project document was approved in March 2002, and activities started (slowly) in July 2002 when the first disbursement was made. The GEF, and later the FFEM, provided funding for the development of a multi-purpose Marine Protected Area around the globally significant marine biodiversity values of the Mnazi Bay and Ruvuma River estuary areas in south Tanzania. In keeping with the Tanzania Marine Parks and Reserves Act, both biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of marine resources by local communities are emphasized.

The project was mandated with the following objectives:

The Goal of the Project is to: **Conserve a representative example of internationally significant and threatened marine biodiversity;** and

The Project development objective is to: **Enable local and government stakeholders to protect effectively and utilize sustainably the marine biodiversity and resources of Mnazi Bay and the Ruvuma Estuary**

To achieve the above objectives, project design identified the following seven broad results (later reworded as "Outcomes"):

- A knowledge base to support marine environmental planning and sustainable development established.
- Local communities and key decision makers are aware of marine problems, benefits and responsibilities of an MPA and use information in decision making.
- Marine Park planning and monitoring processes established, and an initial marine park management plan developed.
- Park general Management Plan under implementation with externalities addressed (phase two only).
- Improved capacity of key stakeholders and institutions for marine conservation and management.
- Alternative Income Generation (AIG) and sustainable use regime activities are researched, developed, piloted and adopted.
- Project effectively managed, monitored and evaluated.

3.0 OBJECTIVES AND PURPOSE OF TERMINAL EVALUATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.0 OBJECTIVES OF THIS TERMINAL EVALUATION

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

- Assess overall performance and review progress towards attaining the project's objectives and results including relevancy, efficiency and effectiveness of the actions taken given the available funding and capacities for implementation.
- Review and evaluate the extent to which the project outputs and outcomes have been achieved, and the shortcomings in reaching project objectives as stated in the project document.
- Assess the project results and determine the extent to which the project objective was achieved, or is expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to any positive or negative consequences.
- Assess the extent at which the project impacts have reached or have the potential to reach the intended beneficiaries; in particular, the balance between conservation and livelihood actions spearheaded through the project.
- To critically analyze the implementation arrangements and identify strengths and weaknesses in the project design and implementation
- Describe the project's adaptive management strategy – how have project activities changed in response to new conditions, (e.g. recommendations of the MTE) and have the changes been appropriate in particular the issue of capacity;
- Assess the project's contribution to the (past) GEF Strategic Priority for catalyzing sustainability of Protected Areas (PAs) (as this was a GEF 2/3 project) in particular improving opportunities for sustainable use, benefit sharing and broad stakeholder's participation among communities.
- Review the clarity of roles and responsibilities of the various agencies and institutions and the level of coordination between relevant players. In particular look at the roles of the Project team, district authorities, and MPRU
- Assess the level of stakeholder involvement in the project from community to higher Government levels and recommend on whether this involvement has been appropriate to the goals of the project.
- Describe and assess efforts of UNDP (CO and UNDP-GEF) in support of the implementation.
- Review donor partnership processes, and the contribution of co-finance.
- Describe key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects for sustainability of project results achieved. Assess the likelihood of continuation of project activities/results, outcomes/benefits after completion of GEF/FFEM funding, considering the "traditional" economic activities in which these communities are involved.
- Identify and document the main successes, challenges and lessons that have emerged in terms of:

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

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

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

5.0 SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

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

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

Institutional arrangement

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

Outcome, results and impacts

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

Partnerships

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

Risk management

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

Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Project Implementation

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

Project Finances

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

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

6.0 PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE TERMINAL EVALUATION

The TE evaluators will be expected to produce:

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

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

B) Presentation of the findings to key stakeholders in a joint UNDP/GEF/FFEM Govt. incl. MNRT/VPO/MPRU team or Steering Committee (Possibly Power point slides) covering key findings of the TE.

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

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

7.0 METHODOLOGY OF EVALUATION APPROACH

The evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner through a combination of processes. The primary purpose of the evaluation is to improve the project; for this to happen all stakeholders must fully understand and identify with the evaluation report, even if they might disagree with some of the contents. The evaluation will start with a review of the key project documentation including key reports and correspondence. It will include visits to UNDP Country Office, Project Executing Offices of Government as well as selected national partners and stakeholders, including interviews (by phone if necessary) with key individuals both within the project, the government, and independent observers of the project and its activities.

Field visits to project sites will be conducted to view activities first hand and to meet with site partners, local leaders, and local government officials. **Note:** not ALL project sites need be visited. It is suggested that the Evaluation Team discuss the optimum number and duration of site visits with the Project team at the start

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

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

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

The following documents will also be available:

- Minutes of the project Steering Committee meetings;
- MAPs of the Mnazi Bay Marine park Area
- Government Agreement with FFEM
- The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks

7.2. Interviews in the field with stakeholders shall include:

- Project team and UNDP staff who have project responsibilities;
- Regional and District authorities
- Manager and Staff in the MPRU
- The Chair of the Steering Committee – and Chair of the Board of MPRU and selected members of the Board
- Project stakeholders, particularly members of the various steering committees and project beneficiaries e.g. Village and village natural resources committee chairpersons;
- FFEM/French embassy representatives if available or by phone/email
- MACEMP coordinator, and WWF representative
- Artumas gas project representatives in Mtwara

7.3. Presentation of the findings

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

8.0. ATTRIBUTES OF THE EVALUATION CONSULTANTS

The TE will be conducted by an independent International Consultant, who will be a team leader and supported by a national consultant. An appropriate project staff will also provide support in the field as may be required including making appointments with regional and district stakeholders. The consultants will be responsible for the delivery, content, technical quality and accuracy of the evaluation, as well as the recommendations. The consultant should possess minimum of MSC degree in environmental related sciences. Ideally they should have the following competencies and attributes:

8.1) Team Leader and UNDP/GEF M&E specialist (International):

- Academic and /or professional background in both academic and institutional aspects of biodiversity conservation projects. A minimum of 15 years of relevant experience
- An understanding of GEF principles and expected impacts in terms of global benefits
- Experience in the Monitoring and evaluation of technical assistance projects, preferably with UNDP or any other United Nations development agencies and donors.
- Demonstrated experience in institutional analysis
- Excellent English writing and communication skills. Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distil critical issues and draw forward looking conclusions.
- Excellent facilitation skills.

8.2) Biodiversity conservation specialist (National consultant)

- Academic and professional background in biodiversity conservation with demonstrated practical experience in participatory processes and socio economics in marine environment
- An understanding of GEF principles and Community-based natural resource management particularly in protected areas
- Experience in implementation or evaluation of technical assistance projects, preferably with UNDP or any other United Nations development agencies and donors.
- Demonstrated experience in institutional analysis
- Excellent English writing and communication skills. Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distil critical issues and draw forward looking conclusions
- Excellent writing and communication skills

Some prior knowledge of the following would be ideal:

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

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

9. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The evaluation will be conducted by a team of two consultants, one international consultant, and one national consultant recruited for a period of 20 days. UNDP will finalize the TOR, recruit the consultants, approve the agenda for the evaluation, and coordinate the evaluation. The project will be responsible for logistical arrangements (setting up meetings, organizing travel). The evaluation will commence on 3rd week of November and will present key findings to the Project TPR in Dar-es-salaam/or Mtwara on the second week of December probably 13th or 15th. A final Terminal Evaluation Report will be submitted to UNDP, no later than 30th December; incorporating all response to comments on the first draft provided by 26th December by UNDP, participating agencies and the project staff.

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

Facilitation. The project team in Mtwara will provide a facilitator to support the team in interpretation, and understanding local institutional / village issues etc if needed.

10. REPORT SAMPLE OUTLINE

Terminal Evaluation Report – Sample outline

1. Executive summary

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

2. Introduction

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

3. The project(s) and its development context

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

4. Findings and Conclusions

4.1 Project Formulation

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

4.2. Project Implementation

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

4.3 Results to date

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

5.0 Lessons learned

6.0 Conclusions and recommendations

7.0 Evaluation report Annexes

- Evaluation TORs
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits, including evaluators findings, issues raised and recommendations by different stakeholders
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results if any
- Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)
- Also include list of acronyms
- Table of Content of the Report.

ANNEX 2 ASSIGNMENT SCHEDULE

| | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Prior to 25 Nov | | Assignment design, methodology, approach (including the methods for data collection and analysis) Planning, preliminary Work Plan |
| Sun 25 | 1000 | Depart Wellington |
| Mon 26 | 2105 | Arrive Dar es Salaam |
| Tue 27 | 0800 0900 1000 1230 1400 | Meet Marine Parks and Reserves Management Unit Meet Director of Fisheries Meet Mr Rumisha, past Director of Marine Parks and Reserves Team Meeting - discuss strengths and preferences, confirm methodology and schedule and arrange appointments Meet Chairman, Marine Parks and Reserves Board |
| Wed 28 | 0800 1400 1500 1700 | UNDP MACEMP Meet Director of Environment Meet Alan Rodgers |
| Thu 29 | 0800 1130 1400 1600 | Meet UNDP - Briefing with UNDP Programme Team Meet WWF - Jason Rubens Meet IUCN - Meet Raymond Lataste, French Embassy |
| Fri 30 | 1155 1430 | d. Dar es Salaam a. Mtwara Meet Project Team – introductory briefing; planning and scheduling; discuss required documentation, etc |
| Sat 01 | 0630 | Day trip – Marine Park handing over ceremony of offshore boats - Msimbati |
| Sun 02 | | Documents review and report drafting |
| Mon 03 | as avail- able | Meet with District Government officials: District Commissioner, District Executive Director, District Natural Resources Officer, District Fisheries Officer, District Community Development Officer, District Planning Officer, District Education Officer Regional Government: Regional Commissioner, Regional Administrative Secretary, Regional Natural Resources Advisor, Regional Planning Officer Mtwara-Mikindani Municipality: Municipal Fisheries Officers Debriefing meeting with project team |
| Tue 04 | | Field visit - Mangrove and Ruvuma Estuary Villages Mahurunga: Mahurunga Sec School (New Classroom), Headmaster – Envirn Club (Teacher and/or students), Village Govt. and VLC, Chairperson, AIG group members, Vegetable Gardening and Chicken rearing groups Khimika: AIG group members (Visit project site) Kilambo: Park gatehouse and office, Village Govt and VLC members, AIG group (Veg gardening), Fish Monitors Tangazo: AIG group members - Bee-keeping, Fishponds (Visit project sites), Chicken rearing (Visit project sites) Litembe and Litembe Pwane: Fish landing site, Comm Turtle Officers, Fish Monitors, AIG (Crab fattening) Debriefing meeting with project team |
| Wed 05 | | Field visit - Seafront and Bay Villages Ruvula: Artumas Project site and (Discussions with Artumas Project Staff) Msimbati: Gatehouse/office, Comm Turtle Officers, Fish Monitors, MOMS at revenue collection point, Meet Village Govt and VLC Chairperson Mngoji: Meet Village Govt and VLC, Chairperson, AIG groups - Fish Ponds, Crab fattening, Bee-keeping Also view the Artumas pipeline route (Wayleave and the ingress point to the Bay) Madimba: Cashew Farmers Co-operative group (NASSURA) |
| Thu 06 | | Visit Nalingu Village Drafting report Meet with NGOs - Meet WWF Project Team, KIMWAM, FOCONA, Shirikisho, Tourism sector, Fisheries sector: TAMPESCA, Mtwara Fisheries Association |
| Fri 07 | | Meet Martin Guard - ECO2 Tourism company and Artumas Environmental Manager Visit Old Boma Final meeting with Project Team - Agree on outstanding info, docs, etc |
| Sat 08 | 1300 1340 | d. Mtwara a. Dar es Salaam Report drafting |
| Sun 09 | | Consolidation of meetings records and notes, preliminary drafting of findings and other aspects of report Team discussions, further documents review |
| Mon 10 | 1400 | Preparation of ppt presentation of preliminary findings PSC Meeting - Present and discuss preliminary findings of the evaluation with project sponsors, national counterparts, Steering Committee. Obtain feedback and reactions |
| Tue 11 | | Report drafting |
| Wed 12 | 1400 | Report drafting Meet UNDP |
| Thu 13 | 2215 | Report drafting and delivery of Final Draft to UNDP Depart Dar es Salaam |
| Fri 14 | | UNDP to distribute draft for comments |
| 15 - 19 | | Period for comments from stakeholders |
| Thu 20 | | End of period for comments – all comments to arrive by end of business |
| Fri 21 | | Team consultations and drafting |
| Sat 22 | | Team consultations and drafting |
| Sun 23 | | Team consultations and drafting |
| Mon 24 | | Final delivery of Evaluation Report – end of assignment |

ANNEX 3 DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

The Evaluation Team was offered, and requested, a number of documents. Some were simply sighted, others were reviewed more deeply. The salient ones were the following:

Anon (2002) *Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results*. United Nations Development Programme Evaluation Office, New York

Board of Trustees for Marine Parks and Reserves, Tanzania (2005) *Mnazi Bay Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park - General Management Plan*

Rumisha, Chikambi K (2007) *A snapshot on the implementation of Phase Two of the Mnazi Bay Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park project from February 2005 to October 2007*. Report to the UNDP/GEF Project 00015405 – URT/00G31/B/1G/99 : Development of Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park with co-finance from FFEM

Financial Consultants & Services (2006) *Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park (Project N.00015405) : Audited Financial Statements for the period of 13 months ended 31 January 2005, Audited Financial Statements for the period of 7 months ended 31 August 2005 and Management for the period of 20 months ended 31 August 2005*. Min Natural Resources and Tourism, Dar es Salaam

Gawler, Meg and Christopher Muhando (2004) *UNDP-GEF Project 00015405 - RT/00G31/B/1G/99 Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Mid-term Evaluation - FINAL REPORT*

Global Environment Facility (GEF) (undated) *Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority Two: Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors*. Washington

Government of the United Republic of Tanzania (2005) *National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty*. Vice President's Office, Dar es Salaam

Government of the United Republic of Tanzania (2005) *The Environmental Management Act, 2004*. Act Supplement No.3, Gazette of the United Republic of Tanzania, No.6 Vol.86

Government of the United Republic of Tanzania (2006) *MKUKUTA – Monitoring Master plan and Indicator Information*. Ministry of Planning, Economy and Empowerment, Dar es Salaam.

Ruitenbeek, J, I Hewawasam and M Ngoile (2005) *Blueprint 2050 – Sustaining the Marine Environment in Mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar*. World Bank, Washington

Stolton, Sue, Marc Hockings, Nigel Dudley, Kathy MacKinnon and Tony Whitten (2003) *Reporting Progress in Protected Areas - A Site-Level Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool*. World Bank/WWF Alliance for Forest Conservation and Sustainable Use. Washington

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2001) *UNDP Project Document - Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park*. UNDP/GEF Project No.URT/00G31/B/1G/99

Also examined were the following project administrative documents:

- Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIRs)
- Quarterly Progress Reports
- Audit reports
- Monitoring reports prepared by the project;
- Minutes of PSC Meetings
- Minutes of Park Advisory Committee Meetings

In addition, the Evaluation Team explored the following websites:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mnazi_Bay-Ruvumba_Estuary_Marine_Park

<http://www.geody.com/geospot.php?world=terra&ufi=-2570264&alc=mtw>

<http://www.tz.undp.org/>

<http://www.mikindani.com/activity/msimbati.html>

<http://www.planetware.com/tanzania/mnazi-bay-marine-reserve-tza-stza-mnazi.htm>

<http://www.infohub.com/outfitters/2621.html>

<http://www.eco2.com/>

http://www.iucn.org/places/euro/prog_links/projects/mnazi.htm

http://www.panda.org/about_wwf/where_we_work/africa/solutions_by_region/eame/our_solutions/conservation/priority_areas/index.cfm

<http://www.authentic Tanzania.com/dive%20mikindani.htm>

http://www.marineparktz.com/mnazi_bay.htm

ANNEX 4 PERSONS MET AND CONSULTED

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Mr Alain Noudehou, Country Director
Ms Gertrude Lyatuu, Assistant Resident Representative Energy & Environment
Mr Abel Mrema, Head of Development Support Services
Ms Gemma Aliti, Energy & Environment
Mr Andrew Yohana,
Mr Alan Rodgers, past UNDP/GEF Regional Coordinator

Marine Parks and Reserves Unit, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism

Ms Anita Julius, Acting Manager
Mr Athuman M Mkwavila, Principal Financial Management Officer
Mr Modest A Kiwia, Chief Marine Conservation Officer
Mr C K Rumisha, past MPRU Manager

Ministry of Fisheries

Mr G Nanyaro, Director of Fisheries

Marine Parks and Reserves Unit, Board of Trustees

Prof Yunus D Mgaya, Chairman

Marine and Coastal Environment Management Project (MACEMP)

Dr Magnus Ngoile, Team Leader
Mr Robert Sululu

Department of the Environment, Vice President's Office

Mr Eric Kamoga Mugurusi, Director

WWF Tanzania Programme Office

Mr Jason Rubens, Programme Coordinator, Rufiji-Mafia-Kilwa Seascape Programme
Mr Elias Zakaria Mungaya, Project Executant MBREMP Conservation

IUCN Tanzania Country Office

Mr Abdulrahman S Issa, Country Director

Embassy of France in Tanzania

Dr Raymond Lataste, Science and Higher Education Attaché

MBREMP Project Management Unit and Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Unit

Milali E Machumu, Project Manager/Coordinator and Park Warden-in-Charge
David Reynolds, Technical Advisor
Jennifer Simbua, Community Conservation Warden
Lucy Ottaru, Administrative and Finance Officer
Ishmael Said,

Mtwara District, Regional Administration and Local Government

Mr Charles Gishuli, District Commissioner
Mr Mohammed Damla, District Lands Officer
Mr Mecky Alfeji, District Fisheries Officer
Ms Sophia Mchatta, Acting Community Development Officer
Mr Mohammed Kiyungi, Acting District Natural Resources Officer
Mr Famjala Mramba, Acting District Planning Officer
Mr Chiriku Chilumba, Acting District Executive Officer

Mtwara Region, Regional Administration and Local Government

Col (rtd) Anatoli Albini Tarimo, Regional Commissioner
Mr Haji Kachechele, Regional Administrative Secretary
Mr Henry Tarimo, Personal Assistant to DC

Mtwara-Mikindani Municipality

Mr Hassan Licholonjo, Municipal Fisheries Officer
Mr Saidi Abdallah, Municipal Fisheries Officer

Mahurunga Secondary School

Mr Msafiri Juma, Science Teacher
Mr Shaaban Chnelepa, Arts Teacher

Mahurunga Village Government, VLC and AIG scheme participants

Ms Mariam Liyambe
Mr Juma Mwale
Ms Salima Hasani
Mr Binang Nachul
Mr Mwajuma Likapa
Ms Halima Chande
Nr Somoe Kanga
Mr Somoe Masimbi
Mr Salum Malunda
Ms Hadija Mninde
Mr Hamis Matuhi
Mr M I Mwalimu
Mr Hassani Mnova
Mr Salinde Kibwana
Mr Mwanadi Bishehe
Mr Alphonse Juma
Mr Mohamed Yusoph
Mr Salumu Malimi
Mr Hassani Amri
Mr Issa Ahamadi Bij
Mr Mohamedi Mutali
Mr Masudi Kitano
Mr Haji Salum Malungu
Mr Mussa Saidi Mnova
Mr Samli Lukanga
Ms Hadija Chitunguli
Mr Issa Chituta
Mr Mzee Likapa
Mr Zainabu Mwango

Khimika AIG, VLC scheme participants

Mr Mohammed Issa, Chairman
Mr Salum Abeid, Secretary
Mr Said Ibrahim, Treasurer
Ms Asha Hamis, member

Kilambo Park gatehouse and office

Mr Mfaume H Amri
Mr Issa M Chimbe
Mr Salumu Salumu
Mr Salum Lipuda
Mr Haji Seleman
Mr Mwanahamisi M Chimae

Mr Ismail H Khalafani
Mr Siwabu H Dadi
Ms Hadija I Kalanda

Tangazo AIG scheme participants

Mr Athuman Chipalu, Secretary, Poultry
Mr Isa Ismail, member, Poultry
Mr Mfaume Muibu, member, Poultry
Ms Fadina Amir, member, Poultry
Mr Isa Mchuzi, member, Fish farming & Beekeeping
Mr Ismail Mputa, member, Fish farming & Beekeeping
Mr Dadi Mazizi, member, Fish farming & Beekeeping
Mr Hassan Mwarabu, chairman, Fish farming & Beekeeping
Mr Sharifu Natunguvika, member, Fish farming & Beekeeping
Mr Hamis Ndenya, member, Fish farming & Beekeeping
Mr Mohamed Nanga, Fish farming & Beekeeping
Mr Ismail Chidoli, member, Fish farming & Beekeeping
Mrs Hawa Namapenya, member, Fish farming & Beekeeping
Mrs Ngujaumi Alawi, member, Fish farming & Beekeeping
Mrs Asha Abdalla, member, Fish farming & Beekeeping
Ms Ndugu Mapalata, member, Fish farming & Beekeeping

Litembe AIG, VLC scheme participants and monitoring volunteers

Mr Jalaldin Bashir, Village Chairman
Mr Mohamed Salum, Village Executive Officer
Mr Wesu Kibaya, member of Fish monitoring
Ms Mwanahamisi Msabaha, Chairperson, VLC
Mr Said Apite, member of Turtle monitoring & Crab fattening

Artumas Gas project

Mr Jim Allan, Plant Commissioning and Start-Up Specialist
Mr Martin Guard, Environmental Manager

Msimbati Park gatehouse, VLC and volunteers

Mr Mwanahamisi M Mshuti
Mr Mohamed Mkuti
Ms Bimkubwa Salumu
Mr Jawari Bakari
Mr Juma H Waziri
Mr Saidi Mohamedi
Mr Mohamedi Mussa
Mr Issa M Namanani

Msimbati Village Government and volunteers

Mr Hassani Mzee Dadi
Mr Asha Abdallah
Mr Saidi M Tilla
Mr Somoe Selematii
Mr Issa Chahde
Mr Fadirir Maarufu
Mr Issa M Makombo
Mr Shifii Selematii
Mr Jawau Bahari
Ms Bimkubwa Salum
Mr Mbaruku Mohamedi
Mr Abrehemati

Mr Juma Hassanii
Mr Massudi Ahmadi

Mngoji Village Government, volunteers and AIG scheme participants

Mr Athumani A Mmuti
Mr Saidi Sauka
Mr Athuma Tunduni
Mr Zainabu Mmalambo
Mr Faraji Faraji
Ms Shada Kambona
Mr Hamis Abrehemadi
Mr Salum Kavende
Mr Ismaili Naleja
Mr Bakari Katungu
Mr Somoe Akola
Ms Asia M Mshuti
Mr Mohamedi Mnungamo
Mr Fatu Nachuli
Mr Issa Mtipa
Ms Mariam M Kumuchola

Madimba Cashew Farmers Cooperative (NUSSURA)

Mr Mbaruku Himbenau, Chairman
Mr Said Lipemba, Secretary
Mr Salumu Akola, member
Mr Bakari Yusufu, member
Mr Athuman Ramadhan, member

Nalingu Village

Mr Hamis Mbwenga, Village Executive Officer
Mr Abdalla Kahamba, sub-Village Chairman
Mr Hemed Suleiman, Village Government member
Mr Abdalla Mohamed, Village Government member
Mr Suleiman Makame, Village Government member

Mtwara Fisheries Association

Ms Fatuma Selemani, member
Mr Mallowellah Mtenda, member
Mr Bashiri Lesheve, member
Mr Mohamed Mwenye, member

KIMWAM NGO

Ms Doris Kaitaba, member
Mr Eusebius Liundi, member
Mr M G Mwamkuu, member

FOCONA NGO

Mr Bright Msalya, member

Shirikisho NGO

Mr Yusufu Maukilo, member
Mr Hassan Ismail, member
Mr A A Luhunga, member

ANNEX 5 MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO MTE RECOMMENDATIONS

MNAZI BAY AND RUVUMA ESTUARY MARINE PARK PROJECT (MBREMP Project)

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM MID-TERM EVALUATION AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

| ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE MTE | PROJECT MANAGEMENT RESPONSE | OBSERVATIONS OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION TEAM |
|--|--|---|
| 1. Strategic Recommendations | | |
| 1.1. Project focus A stronger focus is needed on creating and maintaining good relations with the communities. To this end, priority should be given to helping to improve people's livelihoods | Accepted; Community Conservation Facilitator (CCF) was appointed for a twelve month period to support this aspect of the project. AIG pilot projects were started in the MPA communities and Education and Awareness raising strategy was developed | Budget for component not adequate. Efforts to create relations with communities made but time too short to change communities who have historically been depending on natural resources. |
| 1.2. Implementation All project partners should take a giant step back, and delegate greater responsibility to the project team to implement the project. The partners should work together with a greater degree of trust | Accepted; Since, then the project team on the ground has greater responsibility to implement project activities without any unnecessary interference from Project partners and all project partners are working in harmony. | Harmony has finally been created. |
| 1.3. Operational responsibility The MPRU should assume operational responsibility for the implementation phase of the project, and be held accountable for project deliverables. To ensure that this is a success, capacity building should be given a higher priority | Accepted; With an element of default due to the change over situation between project partners between the Phase 1 (Set Up) and the Phase 2 (Implementation) the MPRU took over the full operational responsibility for the implementation phase of the project. This was done with minimum Technical assistance input for the initial eighteen months of this phase. | There is appreciable capacity, however, there is reported shortage of staff. |
| 2. Project Design | | |
| 2.1. Logical framework The logframe could be strengthened for the second phase by adding a broad result on creating/ maintaining good relations with the communities, and defining specific objectives (sub-results) for this, and setting indicators to monitor progress | Partially Accepted; There was not a change to the Logframe per se as it had elements under which the community relations issues could be addressed. This has been incorporated in the Education and Awareness Raising Strategy, and the activities which are being undertaken to fulfill this during the implementation phase. | Agree with MTE as community relations issues form a major factor for the success of any conservation effort. |
| 3. Implementation Arrangements | | |
| 3.1. Roles and responsibilities The roles and responsibilities of the major project partners – MPRU, UNDP, FFEM, IUCN, and the project team in Mtwara – should be carefully re-examined before the start of the next phase in order to minimize overlap, and support the shift in operational responsibility to the park staff in | Accepted; Terms of Reference for the TA were revised and new ToR for the CCF was developed. | Agree with MTE roles of implementing partners need to be clear and ToR for TA and Manager also should be very clear and non overlapping. |

Tanzania Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Project (MBREMP) : TERMINAL EVALUATION

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Mtwara. Further clarification of roles and responsibilities will be critical to the success of phase two. | | | |
| 3.2. IUCN IUCN's role should be specifically for enhancing MPRU capacity: marine science, managerial support, M&E. IUCN's time should be adequately budgeted, and IUCN should be held accountable for providing advice and capacity building | Rejected; IUCN does not work as a consultancy, and needed a full-time representation on the ground as a full project partner. This could be through engagement and secondment of a TA and not otherwise. | Agree with MTE for example IUCN was instrumental in many processes in the 1 st phase but advisory in the implementation. | |
| 3.3. Separate budgets It will be important to have entirely separate budgets for the aspects of the project that IUCN is responsible for, and those the MPRU is responsible for | Accepted; However, IUCN was not prepared to operate under this regime (see above 3.2) | Agree with MTE | |
| 3.4. Project Coordinator The Project Coordinator / Warden in Charge has a very demanding workload. The PC/Warden's workload should be reviewed, and adjusted to the extent feasible | Accepted; But not implemented due to serious shortage of staff on the ground | Agree with MTE but actually the project coordinator is supposed to be assisted by competent component leaders for each key result area. | |
| 3.5. Technical Advisor A new Technical Advisor is urgently needed in Mtwara. IUCN and MPRU should give high priority to fulfilling this vacancy as soon as possible | Accepted; A period of some eighteen months elapsed before the completion of this. (Due to a large extent on the impasse in resolving administrative and budgetary issues from Phase 1 (Set Up) and finalizing the transition arrangements between Phases 1 and 2). | TA in place though reported to have been recruited late. His responsibility is to provide technical assistance to the project. Should be in place if No extra cost extension is granted. | |
| 3.6. Additional human resources The project and its partners should actively seek funding to support a second Technical Advisor, with the objectives of complementing the skills of the PC and the TA, and of moving forward with critical activities that would be difficult to undertake with the present limited staff complement | Accepted; This was done through the appointment of the CCF by UNDP. However, this was still only partially successful in achieving the overall goal of the recommendation as the then existing "limited staff complement" was further reduced to accommodate/facilitate the up grading of skills and capacity by sending certain staff members on long-term study courses. | Agree as above (3.5) | |
| 3.7. Integration of the project and the park Effort will need to be made in phase two to improve the teamwork between the PC and the TA. A short training in team building may be worthwhile. The responsibilities of all the park staff in relation to the project should be clarified in phase two | Accepted; Largely achieved by the fact that the MPRU, through the PC/Warden-in-Charge, has taken over the overall operational responsibility of the project and thus has by consequence aligned the two entities Park and Project as they should have been. The role of the TA in the implementation phase has been far more practically oriented towards the imparting of knowledge, skills and capacity to the internal park staff and responsible community members on the ground. | Agree TA and PC work in harmony. | |
| 3.8. Budget reallocations For a project to really practice adaptive management, budget reallocation procedures should be simple, straightforward, and rapid. The project needs a transparent and streamlined mechanism for budget reallocations. Well founded budget allocations should occur on a quarterly basis. For a project striving for adaptive management, appropriate budget reallocations, when well justified, should not be the exception – they should be the rule | Rejected; Although the logic of the recommendation is appreciated, the rigidity of budgetary rules and procedures, the diversity of funding sources and the need for the project team on the ground to "keep everybody happy" as regards the implementation of disbursement and procurement rules and policies, and formats of reporting this aspect of adaptive management has not been feasible for the fiscal management aspects. Among those who need to be satisfied in this regard are the auditors, who look at each set of rules and policies for compliance. The park and project accountant and PC have a difficult enough situation dealing with the existing compliance issues without the complications of re-allocation procedures. This is a function of the situation of micro-management which evolves with the implementation of multiple donor projects where the project partners don't, as mentioned in point 1.2, "take that giant step back". Thus the levels of approval of budgetary re-allocations were not at the field or Park/Project level. | Agree with project team realities. | |
| 3.9. Outsourcing consultants | This was accepted; | Agree | |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>In phase two, the hiring of consultants should essentially be the responsibility of the PC and the TA. They should be supported in this (not micro-managed) by the project partners. This is in line with devolving more operational responsibility to the project team in phase two. A simplified procedure for outsourcing consultants is proposed in Annex 8</p> | <p>However in application this was easier said than done; Payment issues, especially lengthy delays due to the application of required processes, were a large part of the constraint. This was especially the case where foreign currency payments were involved. Secondly, the TA "in the field" considered the use of consultants for certain issues to be, "too theoretical" in some cases, and that the staff and the communities needed to be more intimately involved to leave a lasting and realistic set of skills and knowledge "on the ground". Some of the first phase consultancies especially as regards AIGs produced results and/or recommendations based on theoretical global best practice, rather than on local practical application. This makes for good consultancies but does not necessarily translate into the ideal application for the particular local circumstances in the field and it is here that the onus falls on the staff and the communities to make the efforts viable.</p> | |
| <p>3.10. French expertise In the interest of reducing costs and especially of supporting local expertise, we strongly recommend that studies funded by FFEM follow the same guidelines for selecting consultants as those used for studies funded by GEF/UNDP, i.e., that whenever possible, priority be given first to experts from Tanzania, second to experts from East Africa, and third to international experts</p> | <p>Accepted; However, not implemented</p> | <p>Agree. Priority should be given to Tanzanian experts with the required professional qualifications and renowned record of delivering timely and quality output.</p> |
| <p>3.11. Consultancy contracts Consultancy contracts should be negotiated with a realistic number of days for the work to be done, and a realistic and firmly agreed deadline for a polished draft report. Contracts should include a financial penalty for late submission of the draft report</p> | <p>Accepted; Not yet addressed as the focus during phase II is practical implementation</p> | <p>Agree</p> |
| <p>3.12. Finalizing consultants' reports The TA, PC, EARO and MPRU should provide comments to the consultant on their draft report within two weeks of its reception. Once the final draft is submitted, IUCN EARO should edit and publish the report as soon as possible, but no later than one month after submission</p> | <p>This became a bit irrelevant following the transition from Set Up Phase to Implementation Phase. The IUCN role was significantly altered.</p> | <p>Within two weeks depending on the duration of the consultancy.</p> |
| <p>3.13. Project timeframe and no-cost extension Two years is a very short time to accomplish the set of tasks within the project's planned phase two. Therefore the project should consider examining the budget to see if phase two can be extended within the available finances so as to increase the implementation phase to two and half years. In addition, a no-cost extension should be envisaged if not all the funds are spent at the end of the official lifetime of the project. FFEM funds, on the other hand, have a non-negotiable spending period, and should be spent first</p> | <p>Accepted; There was a realization of the logic of this recommendation, and although the phase two has already effectively run in excess of the originally allocated 24 months (currently 33 months – Feb 2005 to date); it has just been confirmed that the period was too short, or the programme too optimistic. It also needs to be borne in mind that there was a stagnation in the rate of implementation in the initial stages of phase 2 while uncertainties from phase 1 where being sorted out. There was also a period of some 18 months of no TA presence in the project area. This being said, it is also true that FFEM funding was not spent first due in part to the chain of project fund disbursement.. Also, the slow rate of implementation of the project activities, due to a number of factors i.e.; resistance from local communities, inadequate number of staff at project level etc., also made for a slow rate of disbursement. However, it is felt that rate of disbursement is not a particularly accurate indication of the success or not of project implementation.</p> | <p>No EXTRA cost extension proposed</p> |

Tanzania Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Project (MBREMP) : TERMINAL EVALUATION

| 4. Knowledge Base | | |
|--|---|---|
| 4.1. Sustainable livelihoods The comprehensive feasibility study to pilot alternative income generation and sustainable livelihoods is critically important and should be initiated without further delay. | Accepted; Done on a pilot project basis for the majority of the suggested AIG areas of activity. | Commercial justification of the AIGs not established. |
| 4.2. Fisheries Every effort should be made to ensure that the results of the fisheries study are available for the consultation in early December on the GMP. (The report was due on 30 November 2004) | Accepted; Done. The results of the fisheries assessment done by Labrosse, Jim Anderson and Kamkuru where used in the development of the GMP. However, for a variety of reasons, many of the recommendations have not been implemented in the field. | Information from the study may have been used to designate resource management areas. |
| 4.3. Fisheries According to Malleret & Simbua (2004), information on the sustainability of fisheries and shell collection is needed, together with an indication of how users themselves see how the status of the resources has evolved over time | Accepted; A MOMS module has been developed to allow for an on-going assessment of the collection of shell and other intertidal resources. This has been tried in the field and found feasible, but training of community monitors and field rangers to collect and supervise this field activity is as yet outstanding. | Most honorable rangers and monitors still need to be provided with basic working tools and facilitated with transport as some stay far away from the point of sampling. |
| 4.4. Fisheries According to Obura (2004), lobster, octopus and sea cucumbers urgently need improved surveys for proper management | Accepted; Why no outside studies/surveys. Because there was already a large data set available requiring more management action than the already hard pressed staff could provide. Not actioned due to staff shortages at first, but this is now being partially addressed through its inclusion in the coral monitoring component of the MOMs. | Management should be based on the available information. Fisheries Act of 2003 ban collection or trading on Sea cucumber. |
| 4.5 Coral Mining According to Guard (2004), a comprehensive study of the potential, needs and limitations of alternative lime production using fossilized coral and improved fuel technologies should be initiated by the project together with government and private sector partners as a matter of priority | Not / Accepted; This is beyond the scope of the marine park area only, it is more of a Regional or even National coastal issue. This does not detract from its overall importance, just from its direct relevance, and immediate importance to the MPA given its resource capabilities. | Private-Public partnership process can be initiated for the activities to be undertaken outside park areas. |
| 4.6. Tourism Encourage tourism through the development of a tourism master plan | Accepted; Partially implemented through; TIF developed through the Mtwara Development Corridor (MtrDC) and now to be refined through the District Economy and Social Empowerment (DESEMP) Project, and to be done in conjunction with a GoT task team which will take the process on from TIF through an Investors forum, acceptance of proposals by Investors/Developers and to allocation of development concessions.. | Agree with Project response |
| 4.7. Reports Standard requirements for reports should be specified in all consultancy contracts. The ToR should require: • An executive summary for all reports • A village-friendly summary, including illustrations, that can be translated into Kiswahili • An appendix with a complete species list for all biodiversity assessments | Accepted; Partially implemented | Some reports already translated into swahili |
| 4.8. Library It would be good to reorganize and replenish the park technical library, and provide security so that documents do | Accepted; Fully implemented, the library falls under the control of the Office Management Secretary, but due to space limitations the actual resource is | Agree with MTE and partially disagree with PTeam response since such valuable information that has been collated using a lot of project funds need to be |

Tanzania Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Project (MBREMP) : TERMINAL EVALUATION

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| not disappear. It may be advisable to place the technical library under the supervision of the Office Management Secretary rather than the Warden in Charge | located in the PC/Warden-in-Charge's office. The original training that was done on library management was largely lost with the leaving of the original post incumbent. | well cared. |
| 5. Awareness | | |
| 5.1. Outreach Far more attention must be paid – and urgently so – to providing information to local communities on the purpose of the park, its management targets, and proposed regulations. The rationale of including certain villages and not others must be clearly explained. This should be continued during and following the development of the GMP | Accepted; This is a critical part of the Education and Awareness strategy and its implementation in the Park. A far greater emphasis has been placed on this aspect of activities throughout the implementation phase. Successes have been better in certain sectors of the stakeholders' corps than in others for a variety of reasons. (Example is the Regional and District Govt sectors have required frequent review and repetition due to the regular change over of staff in this sector) | Agree as such information when conveyed frequently may change the mind set of some communities that are hostile to the establishment of the park. |
| 5.2. Awareness raising strategy It would be good to bring in expertise to help develop a more strategic and structured approach to raising awareness, and to build the capacity of park staff in outreach, communications and education | Accepted; Largely achieved, (through the training and exposure of relevant staff through outside sources). Also the employment of the CCF... | Agree for the same reason as 5.1 above |
| 5.3. Monitoring It would be good to include levels of awareness in both the project and the park monitoring plans. For example, awareness testing could be carried out before and after the implementation phase in order to detect changes in the knowledge and awareness of key target groups | Accepted; The aspect as a whole has been picked up in the MOM system, but the current module concentrates more on effort than effect. The inclusion of "Levels of Awareness" needs to be urgently considered. | Agree but monitor also on compliance |
| 5.4. Returning knowledge The project should produce village-friendly Swahili summaries of all the technical reports to give back to the people from whom the information has been extracted | Accepted; Swahili summaries related to technical reports and other relevant documents are being made available to local community members and other stakeholders through MBREMP newsletters produced twice a year, posters, brochures and presentation made during the seminars, workshops and meetings. | Agree some Swahili reports and brochures/flyers/leaflets exist. |
| 5.5. Study tours Study tours are a very effective means of raising awareness on solving environmental problems and on the potential benefits of a marine park. They should be continued in the next phase, and should target influential stakeholders and decision makers who will be able to share their experiences with other stakeholders | Accepted; This has been implemented as planned. | Agree |
| 5.6. Curriculum development Science programmes in schools in the area of the park should ensure that a substantial portion of the lessons relate to the specific context of the Mnazi Bay - Ruvuma Estuary | Accepted; Despite its acceptance, it is very difficult to make major changes to curriculum content as such. However, the CC section staff members have targeted the relevant teachers and students directly as part of their awareness and educational outreach activities to make the MBREMP context clear. In 2005 an environmental education curriculum was developed by the CC section of MBREMP for introduction to Park schools, however, before this could be implemented the Min of Educ overhauled the primary school curriculum making the use of the developed EE material difficult. Currently there is an environmental education subject curriculum prepared by the Min of Educ; which the Park's CC section will use, in conjunction with the WWF project staff, with the necessary refinements to optimise its relevance to the park's situation and core issues and to encourage the use of relevant contextual examples in a cross-curricular fashion. | Agree. Schools within the park should know the scientific, socio-economic benefits of a park. |

| 6. Strengthening Relations with Local Stakeholders and Country Ownership | | |
|--|---|--|
| 6.1. Benefits It is urgent to ensure that benefits begin flowing to the villages within the park as soon as possible | Accepted; However, the implementation rate has been slow and the benefits to the villages as a whole have, as yet, been small given the extent of the high population in the Park area. | Agree |
| 6.2. District The role of the District in the management of the park must be fully clarified, since under decentralization they are technically responsible for managing natural resources | Accepted; The role of the district regarding the management of natural resources in the Park area was clarified in a number of gatherings including Advisory Committee meetings, where the District council has three representatives and more clarification was made through working together with staff from District Natural Resources Office. However, the park legislation continues to supersede all other legislation within the area and the District remains one of the key stakeholders of the Park. | Agree |
| 6.3. District Co-operation between the MBREMP and other government agencies is critical if it is to achieve its objectives. According to Hadingham (2004), a more proactive approach needs to be undertaken by both the MBREMP and the government agencies it needs to work with. We endorse Hadingham's recommendation that the MBREMP and the District Planning Office jointly establish a MBREMP Forum, which would meet monthly to exchange information | Accepted; The forum is in place namely; District Environmental Committee under leadership of the District Commissioner. Through this forum different government and NGO organizations meet and discuss various issues related to their functions. This is also an avenue for lobbying mutual support and enhancement of collaborative management. | Agree |
| 6.4. Nalingu A two-pronged approach is recommended to solve the impasse with Nalingu. First, as a goodwill gesture, the MBREMP should request (and if necessary lobby for) the withdrawal of the court cases against the 17 defendants. Then the project should demonstrate in neighbouring villages, as soon as possible, the positive benefits the park can provide | Accepted; The Park approached Nalingu people and expressed its intention to withdraw the court cases against 17 defendants; the village was not cooperative on this matter until when cases were ruled out by the court. The park is implementing a number of AIG projects, gear exchange programmes and supporting development activities in neighbouring villages to demonstrate the benefits that can be provided by the park. However, to date Nalingu resistance against the park and its objectives is still there. | Do not agree. The case of Nalingu is, first, manipulation of politics for personal gains and second, endemic ignorance of conservation issues. |
| 6.5. Village management plans The village environmental management planning process seems to have gone well. It is critically important that the project not drop the ball on the village management plans. Even though most of the implementation of these plans will be done by the communities, the park must ensure that it plays its role in helping them | Accepted; Addressed partially; implementation of the VEMPs will now be mainly done by and in conjunction with the WWF project which is currently on the ground. | Agree |
| 6.6. VLCs The park should look into the advisability of fusing the Village Liaison Committees with the existing natural resources committee in each village, so that there is one committee in each village responsible for environmental issues | Accepted; Village Natural Resources Committees (VNRCs) are no longer functional in the Park villages, Some of the VNRCs members are now VLCs members. | Agree |
| 6.7. Mid-term evaluation As requested during our meetings with the communities, a summary of this evaluation report should be made available in Kiswahili to all the VLCs | Accepted; Findings of the Mid – term evaluation report were communicated back to local communities through outreach materials and formal gatherings. | Agree |
| 7. Marine Park Planning | | |

Tanzania Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Project (MBREMP) : TERMINAL EVALUATION

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 7.1. Strategic development There is a distinct chance that development around what is perceived as a wealth generating industry will attract people without jobs from nearby provinces. As suggested by Clive Wilkinson, consideration should be given to bringing the whole Mtwara Development Corridor under management through a series of linked projects | Accepted; Mtwara Development Corridor is one of the key stakeholders of the Park and its management is more than willing to work together with the Park. Similarly, with a follow-up programme which is more centered on Mtwara itself. The District economic and social empowerment programme (DESEMP) which is being funded by Formin Finland and implemented by Niras Scanagri.. | Agree. During the preparatory phase DESEMP will identify economic opportunities existing in Mtwara district. |
| 7.2. Coral reefs According to Obura (2004), the resilience of coral reefs in the MBREMP seems to be high, which would provide a strong foundation for zoning and management of the park. The critical need is to identify and adequately protect key sites and sufficient area to restore ecosystem health and support sustainable use. Fish populations in the more exposed outer reef areas may be critical larval sources for local and downstream reef systems | Accepted This idea was taken into consideration and implemented during the zoning plan; some of the mentioned areas are either core or "no take zones" or "specified use zones". | Agree |
| 7.3. No-fishing zones It is widely agreed that no-take zones should cover 30% of the marine park. According to Wilkinson, the declaration of no fishing zones will result in income losses for periods of five years and may be more. Therefore careful consideration should be given to recognizing this and providing alternatives so that increased pressures are not placed on adjacent areas, or that the MPA will become a focus for discontent | Not Accepted; Less than 20% of the proposed areas are core or "no take zones"; community members want to see the difference before allocating more areas. However, piloting of Alternative Income Generating activities aimed to meet the purpose is on going. Refer also to 7.2 above and to the relevant section of the 2006/7 PIR report. | Agree |
| 7.4. Collaborative management It is hoped that the GMP will develop clear objectives for community participation in the management of the park, as well as workable guidelines on how to operationalize collaborative park management, shared by the MBREMP and the communities | Accepted Clear objectives for community participation are well addressed in the GMP as the management role of various stakeholders particularly communities are clearly stated. | Agree |
| 7.5. Revenue sharing with communities We hope that the mechanism for sharing revenues with the communities will be clearly spelled out in the park's GMP, which is currently under development | Accepted; The principle is accepted, however it was not picked up in the GMP. The limited revenues which the Park has generated to date have been shared with communities through the supply of furnishings for the Msimbati school and the construction of a classroom at the school in Mahurunga. Support was also provided to women's groups in Msimbati. This item will be further addressed after completion of the review of Marine Parks and Reserves legislation., and as the revenue stream grows to a point where more meaningful amounts can be shared with communities. | A diversified Revenue generation is a step towards achieving financial sustainability. A menu of mechanism for generating or collecting revenue within the MBREMP should be identified which may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oil or Gas Concessions • Coastal land or island development • Tourism • Research fees • Commercial, sport or artisanal fisheries |
| 7.6. Immigration Outsiders may "invade" the marine park area and exploit resources that the locals have agreed are protected. A mechanism is needed to provide the park and community wardens with the power and authority they need to exclude outsiders. National and state governments must back this authority | Accepted ; Addressed in the MBREMP regulations, through which the park warden has been given authority to issue permits to outsiders who want to use marine Park resources and such applications will be submitted to the warden after being screened by respective village governments | Agree |
| 8. Marine Park Management | | |
| 8.1. Administrative structure | Accepted; | Agree. Efforts should be made to recruit the officer |

Tanzania Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Project (MBREMP) : TERMINAL EVALUATION

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>The MBREMP should consider adding a Natural Resources Management department, which would be responsible for preparing and implementing the plan for monitoring marine resources, and for supporting the link between research and park management</p> | <p>MBREMP added a new department namely; Research and Monitoring Department and employed a Senior Research and Monitoring Warden to facilitate a link between research/monitoring findings and management issues. (Unfortunately the incumbent has resigned and the post is currently vacant, but has been re-advertised and is awaiting filling).</p> | |
| <p>8.2. Enforcement The staff of the licensing and enforcement unit would benefit from training in relevant legal matters, law enforcement, conflict resolution, and community conservation</p> | <p>Accepted; Partially implemented through in-house training, and knowledge sharing between the staff of the respective Dept's.</p> | <p>Agree with MTE</p> |
| <p>8.3. Destructive fishing gear The project should give top priority to the feasibility study planned to develop and pilot alternative gear and sustainable fishing methods. Given the poverty of the local fishers, if inappropriate fishing gear is to be confiscated, the park needs to be ready to offer alternatives</p> | <p>Accepted; An initial Gear Exchange Programme was implemented in the Estuary / Mangrove adjacent villages (October – November 2005). This was only partially successful in achieving the objective of reducing unsustainable fishing as a large proportion of the new sustainable gear was sold off to fishers in Mozambique and then replaced with cheaper, similar unsustainable gear to that which was replaced. This aspect has been considered and addressed through the entering into of contractual agreements with beneficiaries of the second phase of this gear exchange programme, being undertaken in the seafloor villages.</p> | <p>Agree but there is a general complaint that the gear exchanged for is for offshore fishing where the sea is rough a requires a purposely built crafts and courageous fishermen</p> |
| <p>8.4. Coral mining It will be important that the park work together with the District authorities to stop coral mining in the areas adjacent to the park</p> | <p>Accepted; Initially a highly successful joint operation was undertaken and a short-term interim respite was achieved in this practice. However, the lack of consistent follow-up at the District and Regional level has resulted in a resurgence of this practice which is again reaching its prior levels. Recently the Park staff have motivated and joined the local Municipal and District Govt staff to conduct an operation in this regard in the greater Mtwara / Mkindani area. MBREMP staff also participated in this operation and made boats available.</p> | <p>Agree</p> |
| <p>8.5. Entry fees A strategic approach should be taken during the preparation of the GMP as to how best to develop the struggling tourism industry in the park, and the question of entry fees should perhaps be reviewed together with local stakeholders (hoteliers and other potential tourism partners). An intermediate category should be added in the fee structure to better accommodate visitors who are resident expatriates with valid work permits. A willingness-to-pay survey would no doubt be helpful in determining the most appropriate entry fees</p> | <p>Accepted; Partially implemented, following a meeting with the potential beneficiaries of the interim tier of the fee structure. This was then run for a period before the Park Management was instructed to remove the benefit to the particular group (ex patriot volunteers) due to a perceived loss in the short-term income for the period when compared to the previous year.</p> | <p>Agree</p> |
| <p>8.6. Park brochures All paying visitors should be given a brochure describing the park and what it has to offer, as well as the rules, and guidelines for appropriate behaviour.</p> | <p>Accepted; Brochures describing various Park resources were produced and made available to the visitors entering to the Park area. Posters with similar information are placed on the notice board at the Park entrance gate.</p> | <p>Agree especially important at Kilambo boarder post and Msimbati MBREMP gate</p> |
| <p>8.7. Artumas gas development and energy The park should insist that the Artumas project include credible plans for mitigating potentially harmful impacts of suspended sediments during the construction phase, as well as provisions for ecological monitoring throughout the lifetime of the project in order to demonstrate the minimal level of environmental impacts anticipated by the EIS, and to provide early warning for any impacts that generation</p> | <p>Accepted; This aspect of development within the park, has been a major focus of park inspection and monitoring activities during the implementation phase of this project. Sometimes at the exclusion of other project activities which could have had other beneficial impacts, but to ensure the reduction of immediate potentially negative short and long-term impacts. A close relationship has been developed with Artumas; especially their</p> | <p>Agree</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| project will need to be mitigated. The project should follow up with Artumas on their offer to share data collected from bathymetric and other surveys | environment, health and safety department. The implementation Phase of this project has coincided with the Development of the Artumas Phase 2 developments and the current EIA process for the Phase 3 developments by the Artumas Group. | |
| 9. Marine Park Monitoring | | |
| 9.1. Monitoring system A comprehensive marine park monitoring system needs to be developed as a priority to provide the critical information that is needed for effective park management. It should be designed to involve both park staff and local communities | Accepted; The start of this process was delayed somewhat by the lack of a resident TA. This process has now been initiated and the Management Oriented Monitoring System (MOMS) was accepted as the route to pursue. An outside consultant was engaged to develop and initiate the process and the initial modular content has been developed to complement the existing park monitoring and reporting systems as appropriate. Past and current reporting and Management effectiveness surveys should be continued in conjunction with the newly added MOMS components. Staff and relevant community members have been involved at all stages of the development of the process and training has been given as required. | Agree |
| 9.2. Participatory monitoring Attention must be paid to developing participatory monitoring techniques whereby communities collect and analyze environmental and socio-economic data | Accepted; As above. But on-going. | Agree |
| 9.3. Socioeconomic monitoring Monitoring should include data on key socio-economic parameters to demonstrate changes in people's livelihoods associated with park management. Especially for socio-economic data, local communities should be intimately involved in collecting and interpreting the information collected, as well serving as key informants. Socio-economic indicators should be developed in collaboration with the communities, and the design of the socio-economic monitoring scheme should be presented to the communities for their approval | Accepted; A follow-up survey to track changes from the baseline survey is planned for this quarter of 2007. The Institute for Marine Sciences (IMS) is also proposing such a survey in the park area and the feasibility of linking these efforts is being pursued. | Agree |
| 9.4. Socioeconomic monitoring Malleret (2004) recommends that the following indicators be monitored: • community occupational structure (in the most marine dependent villages) • resource use patterns (in the most marine dependent villages) • the trade of seashells, sea cucumbers and octopus (in all relevant villages) • marine product prices (in all relevant villages) • relative socio-economic status of marine resource users (in selected villages) | Accepted; As above.... to be considered and incorporated. | Agree but should if possible monitoring for compliance |
| 9.5. Artumas gas development project The park should include in its own monitoring the effects of the construction and operation of the Artumas energy generation facility and pipeline. Burying the pipeline in the intertidal area is sure to result in increased sediment loads to the nearby coral ecosystems. The park should take baseline assessments of sediment loads and turbidity at | Accepted; Monitoring was done in conjunction with the Artumas environmental Dept. throughout the dredging, and pipe laying process. Artumas acquired a turbidity curtain to use during the dredging process to protect the nearest reef areas should this prove necessary; its use was in fact not required. The reef complex which is closest to the pipeline is part of the on-going participatory coral condition monitoring program. | Agree |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| key locations along the proposed pipeline route before construction begins. These sites should then be monitored for sediment loads / turbidity during the construction phase and every six months during the operation of the pipeline | | | |
| 9.6. Artumas As part of the approval process, the park should insist that Artumas conduct ecological monitoring (not presently foreseen) so as to demonstrate that the gas project is not harmful to the park and its ecosystems, and to provide early warning when corrective actions are necessary. It can be argued that ecological monitoring is not only good environmental practice, but also good business practice | Accepted; Artumas has in fact a full-time environmental manager and a Dept for EH&S issues related to the development project. For all developments it is standard procedure for the proposal to be referred to the Park management, with technical and environmental motivations, for approval (with conditions or monitoring actions for compliance) prior to such developments taking place. | Agree with steps taken by Artumas | |
| 9.7. Artumas The park should obtain written agreement from Artumas that data collected on bathymetry, currents, etc, will be made freely available to the marine park. | Accepted; There is an open arrangement with Artumas as regards data sharing, except where the data is directly related to the business development interests of Artumas. This is compliant with the Tanzania Exploration and Extraction of Petroleum legislation. | Agree | |
| 9.8. Advisory Committee The effectiveness of the MBREMP Advisory Committee could be improved. For example, the committee could take a more proactive role in helping the marine park to improve problematic relations with disaffected villages, or with government departments where collaboration is not as effective as it should be | Accepted; The Advisory Committee is currently more proactive in overseeing all Park activities including monitoring and approval of on-going gas development. | Agree | |
| 10. Building Capacity | | | |
| 10.1. Capacity building strategy Effective capacity building will require a strategic, and far more structured approach. Two capacity building strategies should be developed with agreed target audiences, objectives, performance indicators: one for the park staff, and one for resource users. The strategies should include provisions for regular monitoring and reporting | Accepted; The capacity is being built for both categories; staff members, based on the training programme and resource users based on the identified needs. The rate of implementation is slow given the level of resources and the other demands on time. | Agree | |
| 10.2. Sustainability MPRU should make every effort to ensure that the effort to build the capacity of the Warden and the senior management staff of the park continues to benefit the park. This may require the development of special incentives to retain staff in the park whose capacity has been built | As above, However, GoT and MPRU as a Statutory Board controlled body under the Dept of Fisheries, do not have any legislative or policy instrument to effect a retention of staff. The incentive issues which inherently exist are the working environment, and the opportunity to work in the MPRU controlled MPAs in the fields in which the further qualifications are gained, and the fact that MPRU salary structures are generally above those of GoT for similar positions. However, should openings in the private, or international sectors come about there are no further incentive schemes in place to retain such staff. | NOTE: There is a need for this issue to be pursued by MPRU at the organizational level. | |
| 10.3. Role of consultants ToR for all external consultants should systematically spell out capacity building requirements such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the individuals or groups targeted specific objectives for building capacity, for example that the person be able to repeat the study on their own including not only data collection, but also data analysis tasks to be performed to build capacity | Accepted; Partially implemented as some consultants involved, MBREMP staff, District council staff and local community representatives in conducting surveys, this mechanism in one way or another helped to build capacity of the targeted groups. | Agree where applicable | |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>• specific provisions for knowledge sharing, including: - presenting a seminar to all park staff and interested partners from the district on the draft results of the study, and - preparing, in addition to the technical report, a village-friendly summary that can be translated into Kiswahili, and shared with all the villages in the park and with other interested stakeholders</p> | | | |
| <p>10.4. PC The PC would benefit from training in project management, time management, human resources management, project planning, and monitoring and evaluation</p> | <p>Accepted; This is a truth but the time and other constraints on this individual and position have even restricted any further study options. The workload and project timeline have proved to be far too optimistic for the situation on the ground, and the available resources in terms of staff and transport.</p> | <p>Agree with MTE</p> | |
| <p>10.5. Park staff Training for park staff is needed in conflict resolution, data analysis, park interpretation, report writing, time management, and monitoring and evaluation</p> | <p>Accepted; Partially implemented, through the various approaches taken and the outside training opportunities found and used during the implementation phase thus far. This process is on-going.</p> | <p>Agree</p> | |
| <p>10.6. Marine resource monitoring All the staff who will be involved in marine resource monitoring should be trained as soon as possible in scuba diving: the Warden in Charge, the other Wardens and the Boatman. Once the monitoring strategy is finalized, other specific training needs for resource monitoring can be determined and prioritized</p> | <p>Accepted; This was again the ideal situation and was not found to be practical or feasibly implementable in the field. The majority of the relevant staff were barely swimming capable, and so swimming training, snorkel training were the first steps necessary. These were taken and the staff and some of the community members are now capable of implementing snorkel based monitoring programmes on their own. The plans are now in place to further the training for those staff and certain community members who are competent to scuba level. Certain of the staff who were in these positions when the MTR took place have since left for long-term study or other capacity building training, whilst some have left the Project.</p> | <p>Agree with recommendation</p> | |
| <p>11. Sustainable Livelihoods</p> | | | |
| <p>11.1. Promises There is a wide perception among the communities of broken promises, and this urgently needs to be addressed</p> | <p>Accepted; This appears to be a recurrent problem, and is part of the traditional suspicion of things outside of the norm. This perception creation has its basis in certain broad statements made by politicians in addresses to communities during the pre-proclamation and gazette period of the park's development. There was also an element of perception during the set-up phase of the Project and the Park as separate entities, and the change of management approach during the implementation phase has gone some way towards allaying certain of the negative perceptions/fears and leveling expectations. Most of the promises made since the inception of the Park and certainly of the project have been met/fulfilled. It is true that in some instances the delays in implementation of certain aspects tend to give some reason to such perceptions. There are certain elements within some of the communities who, for reasons of personal benefaction, persist in encouraging these negative perceptions.</p> | <p>Agree the overriding complains from the MIMP communities is the issue of unfulfilled promises.</p> | |
| <p>11.2. Sustainable resource use The consultancy to assess the feasibility of and pilot changes in fishing gear and fishing effort should be carried out as soon as possible, with a special focus on the most</p> | <p>Accepted; The expectation and intention here was to see changes, over time, in fish catches and in the use of sustainable types and methodologies of fishing.</p> | <p>Enough knowledge was to be gathered on alternative fishing strategy that can be easily adopted by affected communities.</p> | |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| <p>vulnerable marine resource dependent communities: Mkubiru, Msimbati, Tangazo and Mngoji, and eventually Nalingu</p> | <p>11.3. Utando fishing According to Malleret (2004), further information on the cultural, social, religious, and economic factors that affect women's economic opportunities in the MBREMP will be necessary for the park to work with the many women who practice <i>utando</i> fishing in order to identify appropriate alternative sources of livelihood</p> | <p>Accepted; As part of this process a programme of constructive engagement was embarked upon by the supply of improved utando nets and a piloting of their use with women's groups in Msimbati. It was to be assessed as to whether this would increase the catch of target species (dagaa – sardines) and reduce by-catch of the juveniles of other non-target species. It has been observed that the by catch rate has not been significantly reduced. Training in the effective and sustainable use of these gears is perhaps still another option. There is, however, a need to encourage and facilitate these women to leave the utando fishing and engage in other alternative income generating or livelihood activities. This is itself not without problems as the alternatives need to be accessible to these women's homes, and this limits the potential market opportunities.</p> | <p>Agree. Most women remarked that utando catches juveniles of various fish and rarely catch 'dagaa' which is a pelagic fish. Women cannot fish in the pelagic therefore the idea of supplying them with improved utando nets was uncalled for. This was therefore a wrong move by the management.</p> |
| <p>11.4. Other AIGs The consultancy to assess the feasibility of and pilot alternative income generation activities should be considered an urgent priority. This should investigate the conditions for success of alternative income generation activities, and answer the question: "What are the conditions that allow marine dependent households to switch from marine resource exploitation to other activities in a long-lasting way and become better off?"</p> | <p>Accepted; The pilot AIGs where implemented and as they have and continue to progress, assessments of the relative success rates and factors are being identified. Value chain-analyses and the on-going monitoring will hopefully answer the question in the longer-term</p> | <p>Agree with management that Value Chain Analysis is a requirement for all the AIGs</p> | <p>Agree with management that Value Chain Analysis is a requirement for all the AIGs</p> |
| <p>11.5. Microcredit Micro-credit schemes for the marine resource user groups would help to create an enabling environment for alternative livelihoods, and should be implemented as soon as possible. Special consideration should be given to sustainable microcredit schemes where the initial capital is constituted from the members' own resources, rather than from loans</p> | <p>Accepted; Staff on the ground lacked skills to implement this activity. The idea has been picked up by WWF project which will focus mainly on supporting the VEMPs and implementation of activities related to community development. This will be piloted to a limited extent on the current off-shore fishing project, with the three groups from Msimbati.</p> | <p>Agree on the move by management to entrust this activity to others (WWF) who have the capacity to execute but MBREMP must monitor closely the implementation.</p> | <p>Agree on the move by management to entrust this activity to others (WWF) who have the capacity to execute but MBREMP must monitor closely the implementation.</p> |
| <p>11.6. Cashew nuts Since they are farmed by most households growing cash crops, cashews are a good entry point for improving livelihoods in the park. Efforts should be made to find ways to increase the value of cashew nuts produced, for example by sourcing more profitable markets, improving quality, diversifying processing, etc</p> | <p>Accepted; But with initial resistance, from a portion of the management team, as it was not seen as core business for the MPA and that there was a plethora of other Govt and non-Govt agencies engaged in the Cashew sector. The final accepted and applied approach has been support and facilitation to a farmer's cooperative group in some of the Park villages to produce a project proposal for a GEF Small Grant Programme for the improvement of their Cashew Farming initiatives. There is still an amount of ambiguity about the direct linkages of this support to the reduction of pressure on the marine resources. This may well prove to be an additional improved income generating project rather than an Alternative</p> | <p>Agree and commend the response raised by management. This may be a buy in strategy which may result in MBREMP being accepted by even those with hostile attitude.</p> | <p>Agree and commend the response raised by management. This may be a buy in strategy which may result in MBREMP being accepted by even those with hostile attitude.</p> |
| <p>12. Project Management and Monitoring</p> | <p>12.1. Project management The key issues that need to be addressed to improve project management include: further clarifying the roles and responsibilities between the</p> | <p>Accepted; It is the belief of the project team that the balance of the roles and responsibilities of the PC and the TA were better defined in the Implementation Phase.</p> | <p>Agree with MTE</p> |

Tanzania Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Project (MBREMP) : TERMINAL EVALUATION

| | | |
|--|---|----------------|
| PC and the TA; better delegation to the project team by partner agencies (UNDP, MPRU, IUCN); more support and encouragement to the project team from partner agencies; and more supportive human resources management on site | There was definitely support and encouragement to the project team by UNDP and MPRU. The IUCN role was effectively reduced to a consulting expert role in this latter phase of the project. | |
| 12.2. Work prioritization The project needs a better balance in its use of resources between improving the biodiversity knowledge base on the one hand and three critical areas on the other - the social sciences, improving livelihoods, and capacity building | Accepted; It is the firm belief in the field that this balance was better achieved, however, this did not give rise to the same amount of baseline studies and information gathering as in the set-up phase, but was more centered on the practical implementation of all issues. The limited resource availability also served to limit the total outputs despite the better balance. | Agree with MTE |
| 12.3. Project planning Broad objectives in the GMP should be broken down into specific measurable management targets, some of which may be site-specific, and some resource specific | Accepted; Only partially implemented... and applied | Agree |
| 12.4. Project planning A revised logframe will be required for phase two, and the activities identified for the various results and sub-results should realistically plan for the number of person-months necessary to achieve each activity in the workplan. Given the extraordinary difficulty that the project team has had in implementing the project workplan, together with the fact that a new TA will need to be recruited and learn about his/her job, every effort should be made when planning the logframe for phase two, to carefully prioritize the activities to be carried out, and to bring the workload in line with the available human resources | Not Accepted; The original logframe has been in use throughout with only minor alterations... The problems encountered with the implementation of this in the set-up phase continued and there was the further complication of some differences between the UNDP/GEF logframe and the FFEM logframe... these were primarily the reason for the alterations referred to above. From a reporting point of view there was resistance to changing the logframe at both the Park and UNDP Level. As the newly recruited TA, it has been found that the element of overoptimistic timeframe and milestones was on-going. There is little or no relation between the expectations of the logframe and the human resources which have been available through the implementation phase. (This has been constantly and regularly recorded). The project was to implement a number of outstanding activities which were either partially done or not done at all during the set up phase, this is another factor which contributed to the minor alteration of the original log frame. | Agree |
| 12.5. M&E strategy The project should give priority to developing an M&E strategy. For the strategy to be realistic, feasible and sustainable, it is important that partners and stakeholders are involved in its design. In the case of the MBREMP project, the process should include relevant District and Regional personnel, community representatives such as selected members of the VLCs, as well as the project team | Accepted; The process of accepting a suitable M&E strategy and its design and implementation have received priority during the Implementation Phase. The suggested inclusiveness of the process has been followed, with the exception of the Regional and District personnel. These personnel are however, not directly engaged in the process at this stage and the necessary widening of the inclusiveness will take place with the necessary training and engagement as and when required. | Agree |
| 12.6. Adaptive management Project progress reports, the APR, and the WWF/WB Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool could be better used as tools for adaptive management by making them more analytical, and by discussing difficulties more openly. To encourage this, it is important that the project partners – especially the MPRU – create a climate of confidence for the project team, whereby shortcomings can be acknowledged, and mistakes can be welcomed as learning experiences | Accepted; The existing system under MPRU and UNDP is highly encouraging adaptive management whereby, shortcomings are acknowledged and mistakes are welcomed as learning lessons and experiences gained in the course of implementing this project. | Agree |
| 12.7. Team building & adaptive management | Accepted; | Agree with MTE |

Tanzania Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Project (MBREMP) : TERMINAL EVALUATION

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>The PC should ensure that the monthly staff meetings and weekly management meetings are held as scheduled. The meetings should be designed to reinforce team spirit and to provide encouragement and a well understood framework for adaptive management</p> <p>12.8. Risk of burn-out All of the staff are regularly working many hours of overtime. This should be minimized by: more realistic work planning, streamlining the implementation bureaucracy wherever possible, and better prioritization and time management</p> | <p>Management meetings to discuss various issues related to implementation of the Park/project activities are convened once in two weeks time and staff meeting convened once in a month. However, extra ordinary meeting can be done irrespective of the planned schedule whenever need be.</p> | <p>Disagree partially. For effective output time should be well budgeted to avoid mental fatigue.</p> |
| <p>12.9 Equipment The following equipment should be purchased before the end of the Set-up phase, for use in patrols, and in preparation for marine resource monitoring, which should start at the beginning of the Implementation Phase: moorings, depth sounder, boat compass, underwater camera, scuba and snorkelling gear, markers, binoculars, ropes, signalling, first aid kits, life jackets, etc</p> <p>12.10 Computers The present system of sharing computers is inefficient. Each Warden should have his/her own computer, together with further training in computer use and the GIS database</p> | <p>Accepted; Despite the fact that this was recognized and accepted: the shear pressure of the logframe design and expected outputs, given that this project is not the only one operational within the Park (MACEMP as well) and the fact that there are certain on-going day-to-day management issues which are not captured in the project document or logframe; as well as the fact that the Artumas programme was very active in implementing their own activities in the park area during this time all contributed to the continued risk of staff burn-out.</p> | <p>Disagree</p> |
| <p>12.11 Office organization Improving the use of space and the organization of everyone's workstations will improve the efficiency of the park/project staff. Creating and maintaining simple systems for organizing one's work pays off in the long run in time saved</p> | <p>Accepted; Partially addressed. The computer system which has evolved through the life of the project is now adequate, but there are certain components which are becoming dated, limited in their capacity to meet the current need requirements. The problem is going to be replacement and on-going maintenance and up-grading of this system.</p> | <p>Agree however, a master copy of important data, information must be stored separately.</p> |
| <p>12.12 Implementation matrix An implementation matrix (see example in Annex 5) should be used on a quarterly basis to assess progress according to the results, sub-results and activities in the project logframe for phase two. In the interest of promoting adaptive management, the "Comments" column can be used to record explanations for deviations from the original plan, proposed changes in the implementation strategy, and proposed shifts in budget allocations. This monitoring matrix is a tool for tracking implementation when status is reported against activities, and is useful for adaptive management</p> | <p>Accepted; The remarks column has been added on the quarterly spread sheet report to record explanations for deviations, proposed changes and implementation strategy.</p> | <p>Agree but should be addressed in the new park headquarters building planned to be built in the near future using MACEMP money.</p> |
| <p>12.13 Results matrix The monitoring matrix can be transformed into a more synthetic tool to track progress towards results, by deleting all the activity lines, and succinctly reporting on the status of each project result and sub-result, together with comments. This should be done on an annual basis and at</p> | <p>Accepted; This is similar to the UND/GEF APR/PIR reporting format used to report progress status of the project..</p> | <p>Agree but different donor have different reporting formats. In this particular case the UND/GEF format should be followed.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| the end of the project in preparation for the final evaluation | | | |
| 12.14 Project reporting Financial reports, workplans, and recommendations for budget reallocations should continue to be submitted on a quarterly basis. However, to lighten the project's heavy administrative load, full narrative technical reports could be prepared on a six-monthly basis, rather than every three months, as long as the implementation matrix is submitted on a quarterly basis as well | Not accepted; The variety of organizations and agencies and their individual systems which require these reports has not allowed for this recommendation to be implemented. However, as mentioned in 12.13 above the use of a reporting format which is more logframe based has eased the process of report development and writing. | As above (12.13) | |
| 12.15 Document template The park should develop a simple template for all reports, memos, and other documents, both internal and external, to ensure that every document is dated and its authorship is clear | Accepted; This is taken care of through the Parks' adoption of the single MPRU, filing system and formatting of documentation. There are still some exceptions as a result of project, or donor agency specific requirements. However, whatever the format, dating and authorship are indicated. | Agree with response | |
| 12.16 PSC Given the fact that Project Steering Committee decisions have not always been followed, it would be good to clarify the oversight role and the authority of the PSC | Accepted; PSC oversight role and authority were clarified to all project partners for their adherence. Also the PSC composition was reviewed. | The PSC is supposed to be the decision making organ designed to guide, the project and approve annual workplans. It is surprising to learn that some its decision were not followed. This is GROSS insubordination. | |
| 12.17 PSC To maximize its effectiveness, the PSC needs to function by email as well as by face-to-face meetings. Hard copies of communications can be delivered by neighbouring members to those few PSC members without access to email. Decisions should be able to be taken by consensus by email. In preparation for the PSC meetings, the PC should send supporting documentation to the members in advance of the meeting. The minutes of PSC meetings should be approved by email within two weeks of the meeting, and decisions taken should be respected by all partners. Minutes should include action points with the responsibilities identified | Accepted; This approach has been tried, but responses to e-mail correspondences and notices etc. are not satisfactory and the approach has as such not been accepted. | Agree to MTE | |
| 13. Identification of Future Needs and Fundraising | | | |
| 13.1 PC and TA Well in advance of the end the implementation phase, the PC and TA should take stock and identify areas that will require future funding, and then contact donors and prepare funding proposals as necessary | Accepted; Currently the thrust, and will form part of the exit strategy currently being developed | Agree on exit strategy currently being developed. | |
| 13.2 Partners All partners should begin now to look for ways to continue supporting the MBREMP after the end of this project. One promising avenue would be to mainstream the needs of the MBREMP into the new WB Marine And Coastal Environmental Management Project in Tanzania | Accepted; The MACEMP avenue was followed up and support obtained. However, there is still going to be a severe constraint on operational funding in the post-project period and alternative sources of sustainable funding still need to be sourced and secured. | Agree but more financing options be sorted out instead of relying mainly on MACEMP | |

ANNEX 6: THE MTWARA RESOLUTION ON MNAZI BAY MARINE PARK

Preamble:

The proposal to establish Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma estuary area as marine park was discussed by representatives from government, community leaders, private sector and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) during a two-day workshop held at the Parish Hall in Mtwara between April 7 – 8, 1999. The workshop participants (listed below) resolved the following: -

That, the economy of the residents of Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma estuary largely depends on marine resources, with fishing being a major economic activity and source of livelihood.

That, the residents of the Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma estuary are also engaged in salt making, seaweed farming and extraction of coral stone for lime production. Mangroves cover a large area in and adjacent to the Ruvuma Estuary and these are a source for construction materials as well as firewood for households. Besides the Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma estuary is within easy reach from the Mtwara Township.

Economic Opportunities:

The Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary coastal area has resources, which are yet to be fully exploited which include stocks of pelagic fish, stocks of prawns, sea cucumber and other shellfish. The area has arable land for agriculture as well as livestock keeping. These resources provide great potential for economic development for the people in Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary through alternative livelihoods, employment and income generation. Resources such as the natural gas and the good quality fish as well as tourism can contribute to the national economy. The presence of white sandy beaches, crystal clear and unpolluted water is an asset for tourism development.

The area is also endowed with the presence of natural gas, and there are possibilities for the presence of other minerals. The good stand of mangrove trees are feeding and breeding sites for fish and other marine life. The Ruvuma area has a natural harbour with deep waters, which can easily be used for docking both small as well as large sea going vessels. The Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma estuary is located at the border with Mozambique creating an environment, which is conducive for the development of trans-border communication and trade between the two countries.

Threats:

In spite of the abundance of coastal and marine natural resources within the area, these resources are being threatened by unsustainable use practices. Such practices include: -

- Dynamite fishing – The practice however has been contained through people's participation.
- Use of inappropriate and destructive fishing gear like beach seine "Kavogo" and small mesh size fishnets.
- Use of poisons (pesticides like *thiodan*) during fishing activities.
- Destruction of live coral reefs.
- Extraction of lime from corals.
- Clear felling of mangrove
- The absence of market outlets for marine products as well as poor infrastructures continues to affect the welfare of the people in the area.
- Lack of alternative sources of livelihood contributes to environmental degradation.
- Lack of community participation in the management of coastal resources.

Resolution:

In order to address effectively these issues and have sustainable development, we the representatives of coastal communities residing within the Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma estuary area together with representatives from

Tanzania Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Project (MBREMP) : TERMINAL EVALUATION

the government, private sector and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), who have participated in this workshop, resolve that the area from Mnazi Bay to Ruvuma estuary be declared as a marine park under the Marine Park and Reserve Act no. 29 of 1994.

The area to be declared as a marine park should include the following villages:

Mahurunga, Kitunguri, Kihimika, Kilambo, Tangazo, Litembe, Hyuvi, Mngoji, Msimbati, Nalingu, Mnete, Mkubiru, Sinde, Msanga Mkuu, Ng'wale, Namela, and Namponda and the coastal sea adjoining these villages.

The following principles should be observed in the course of establishing the marine park: -

- Involvement of communities in the strategic planning, decision making and implementation of the management plan.
- The communities residing in the proposed area should not be relocated.
- The marine park will aim at maintaining sustainable utilization of natural resources as well as the conservation of biodiversity.
- The park management will ensure that income generated from the activities within the park will benefit the community in the area.
- Communities should be mandated to formulate by-laws for effective enforcement. These by-laws should be acknowledged and respected by all levels of the government authorities.

These principles will be achieved through the implementation of the following key activities: -

- The area be formally established as a marine park under the Marine Parks and Reserves Act No. 29 of 1994.
- A management plan and by-laws for the sustainable uses of marine and coastal resources be prepared and approved.
- The management of the marine park should promote community based economic activities including fishing and harvesting of other marine and coastal resources/products in a sustainable manner.
- Research and assessment should be undertaken at regular interval in order to monitor the state of the environmental and resources.
- The management plan should have preferential programs aimed at building capacity to enable women's involved in harvesting marine resources.
- The management of the marine park should prepare capacity building programs that will enhance the villagers participation in the preparation of development programs, trade/business management and appropriate technology.

PARTICIPANTS AT THE STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF MNAZI BAY - RUVUMA ESTUARY PROPOSED MARINE PARK

| NO | NAME | PARTICULARS | NO | NAME | PARTICULARS |
|-----|-------------------|----------------------|----|---------------------|-------------|
| 1. | Fatma Mikidadi | DC, Mtwara | 34 | Ali salumu | Kilambo |
| 2. | A.O Namkulala(MP) | Mtwara Vijijini | 35 | Fatu Saidi Kasanga | Mkubiru |
| 3. | Esther Wakari | DED, Mtwara Vijijini | 36 | Fatu Ali Nassoro | Nalingu |
| 4. | Ismaili Bwamkuu | Msimbati | 37 | Mwajuma Issa Pwicha | Nalingu |
| 5. | Omari Likoni | Msimbati | 38 | Selemani M Mabruki | Tangazo |
| 6. | Hassan Mohamed | Ruvula –Msimbati | 39 | Mohamed Selemani | Mkubiru |
| 7. | Bimkubwa s Kondo | Msimbati | 40 | Mfaume Amri | Mkubiru |
| 8. | Dadi A. Katumbo | Msimbati | 41 | Mohammed Amani | Mkubiru |
| 9. | Alawi A Sadala | Msimbati | 42 | Somoye Omari | Tangazo |
| 10. | Bakari Chato | Namponda | 43 | Mwanahamisi Msabaha | Litembe |
| 11. | Nanenda A Musa | Msimbati | 44 | Mwanahamisi Chimahi | Kilambo |
| 12. | Vick Howe | FRONTIER | 45 | K.I Mnyalu | Ziwani |

Tanzania Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Project (MBREMP) :
TERMINAL EVALUATION

| NO | NAME | PARTICULARS | NO | NAME | PARTICULARS |
|-----|----------------------|-----------------|----|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| 13. | Elizabeth Ndedya | RIPS | 46 | Saidi Kubali | Litembe |
| 14. | Ireneus Komba | Wanyamapori (M) | 47 | Saidi Napata | Mngoji |
| 15. | Mohammed Mkandaa | Ziwani | 48 | Issa Selemani Juma | Mnete |
| 16. | Y. H. C Ngaeje | Ag. DAS Mtwara | 49 | Selemani M Mmule | Mahurunga |
| 17. | B. Nyenyembe | DPLO Mtwara | 50 | Yusufu Ali Mhukilo | Nalingu |
| 18. | E. B Mwakalinga | D/S | 51 | Abdulahamani M Ghasia | Mtwara-SOZOCO |
| 19. | H.M. Mnaule | Msangamkuu | 52 | Selemani S Utohi | Tangazo |
| 20. | Ali Swedi Kasingo | Mtwara Swissaid | 53 | Mohammed H. Nassoro | Mtwara |
| 21. | Mwandike Saidi | Madimba | 54 | John Mwaisaka | Mtwara |
| 22. | Ndumbalo R. A | Mtwara MFO | 55 | Lameck D. Kinyunyu | Mtwara |
| 23. | A. A. Luhunga | Mwenyekiti (W) | 56 | J. Msumba | Mtwara |
| 24. | Musa Ali Lipalangwe | Mnazi | 57 | Captain Kasunguru | Bandari- Mtwara |
| 25. | Mahmood Ali Fundi | Hyuvi | 58 | Zainab Ngazi | IMS Zanzibar |
| 26. | Ahamad Ali Ngoji | Litembe | 59 | Esther Makwaia | Idara ya Mazingira, DSM |
| 27. | Mohamed Issa Shahame | Mngoji | 60 | Magnus Ngoile | NEMC, Dar es Salaam |
| 28. | Issa Ali Dadi | Mngoji | 61 | Frank Kilimba | NEMC Dar es Salaam |
| 29. | Abdala I Nsilo | Kilambo | 62 | Chikambi Rumisha | MPR, Dar es Salaam |
| 30. | Fatu Sadi Hassan | Mnete | | | |
| 31. | Ahmad Mussa | Nalingu | | | |
| 32. | Seleman A. Chihalo | Nalingu | | | |
| 33. | Somoye A. Mmbwana | Mngoji | | | |

ANNEX 7 LIST OF MBREMP PUBLICATIONS

1. MBREMP, (2003): Management Effectiveness of the Mnazi Bay Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park
Unpublished report and contributions for use in the following consolidated publications:
 - a. IUCN (2004): Assessment of Management Effectiveness in Selected Marine Protected Areas in the Western Indian Ocean (Final Report) vii + 29pp
 - b. Wells, S., (2004): Assessment of Management Effectiveness in Selected Marine Protected Areas in the Western Indian Ocean (IUCN EARP – Nairobi) vii + 26ppUsed in the compilation and publication of:
 - c. Wells, S., Mangubhai, S. (2005): Assessing Management Effectiveness of Marine Protected Areas: A Workbook for the Western Indian Ocean. (IUCN EARP – Nairobi) viii + 60pp
2. Guard, M. (2004): Artisanal Coral Mining in Mtwara: description and socioeconomics of lime production (MBREMP) Internal Report. 21pp
3. a. Muir, C.E., (2004) An Assessment of the Status of Turtles, Dugongs and Cetaceans in Mnazi Bay Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park & Recommendations for a conservation Strategy, (IUCN EARO – Nairobi), vi + 59pp
b. Muir, C.E., Abdallah, O. (2004): MAELEZO YA MAFUNZO: Hifadhi ya Kasa na Nguva. TRAINING MANUAL: The Conservation of Turtles and Dugongs, (IUCN EARO – Nairobi), iv + 32pp
c. Muir, C.E., (2004) Implementation of a turtle conservation strategy: Mnazi Bay Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park, Tanzania, (IUCN EARO – Nairobi), ii + 10pp
4. Case Study in Alternative Sustainable Livelihoods (Ireland 2004)
5. Luke, W.R.Q. (2004): Rapid Assessment of the Terrestrial Plant Diversity of Mnazi Bay Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park, Tanzania. (IUCN EARO – Nairobi) iv + 21pp
6. Malleret, D., Simbua, J. (2004) The Occupational Structure of the Mnazi Bay Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Communities (IUCN EARO – Nairobi) vi + 42pp
7. Obura, D., (2004): Biodiversity Surveys of the Coral Reefs of the Mnazi Bay Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park (IUCN EARO – Nairobi) vi + 72pp
8. Training Manual for GIS, GPS and Maps with exercises (Van Walsum & Vermimp 2004)
9. Malleret, D. (2004) A Socio-economic Baseline Assessment of the Mnazi Bay Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park (IUCN EARO – Nairobi) x + 126pp
10. Strategic Development Framework (Hadingham 2004)
11. Wagner G.M., Akwilapo F.D., Mrosso S. and Masinde R. (2004): Assessment of Marine Biodiversity, Ecosystem Health, and Resource Status in Mangrove Forests in Mnazi Bay Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park, (IUCN EARO – Nairobi) viii + 106pp
12. Intertidal Zone (M. Richmond)
13. Overall Synthesis Report Biodiversity (M. Richmond)
14. Fisheries Study (not completed)
15. A Socio-economic Assessment of Sustainable Livelihoods Regimes for Communities of Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park: Incorporating livelihood intervention strategies and proposals for the development of Alternative Income Generating Activities (AIGs) to complement and promote sustainable livelihood regimes (Paul Harrison 2005) 54pp

16. Village Environmental Management Plans (as yet in-publication [final proof form])

For the villages of:

- Mahurunga
- Kithunguli
- Kihimika
- Tangazo
- Kilambo
- Litembe
- Mngoji
- Msimbati
- Madimba
- Mitambo

Internal Materials Publications

1. Min NR&T, (2005): Mnazi Bay Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park – General Management Plan.
2. Awareness and Education Strategy
3. Quarterly and Annual Reports
4. Environmental education programs for Primary School
 - Environmental Education Programme for primary Schools (2004)
 - Implementation Strategy for Conservation Clubs
 - Env. Education Topics and Material for Stds 5-7
5. Training manual for Environmental Education in Primary Schools in the Park (2004)
6. Presentation papers (various) for the local community workshops and training sessions. (2002 -2007)
7. Training Needs Assessment – Report (2004)
8. Educational Calendars – primarily for awareness raising but including environmental conservation messages (produced Annually 2002 -2006)
9. MBREMP Information Brochures (2006 and 2007)
10. Various Educational and Awareness Raising – Posters (2005 – 2007).
 - Mangroves
 - Coral reefs
 - Endangered species (Coelacanth, Turtles)
 - Park Do's and Don'ts...
11. Drawings – from Participatory Drawing competitions
 - Endangered species
 - Marine environment
 - Gas Production (Environmental and Conservation issues)
12. MBREMP newsletters (2 per annum)
13. Park Signboards

| Year | Newsletters | Calendars | Brochures | Posters | T-Shirts |
|---------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 2004 | 1500 | 1500 | - | - | 500 |
| 2005 | 500 | 1500 | - | 4 | 700 |
| 2006 | 1500 | 2000 | 1000 | 1000 | 700 |
| 2007 | 1500 | (MPRU) comb. | 2000 | 80 | 500 |
| Totals | 5000 | 5000 | 3000 | 1084 | 2400 |

ANNEX 8 MBREMP REQUEST FOR NO-EXTRA COST EXTENSION TO FFEM FUNDED ACTIVITIES, 2008

| Programme Support Targets(PSTs) or Objectives | | | | |
|--|--|---|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Overall Activity | Annual Activity | Rationale - Milestones (expected outputs) for each activity (include no. of beneficiaries) | Cost of Activity (Euro) | Cost of Outcome (Euro) |
| PARTICIPATORY IMPLEMENTATION AND CONSERVATION MECHANISMS SUPPORTED AND STRENGTHENED | | | | |
| RESULT Area 1: Local communities and key decision makers are aware of marine problems, benefits and responsibilities of an MPA & use information in decision making. | | | | |
| Outcome 1.1. Continued support for Local community awareness of marine environmental problems, benefits and responsibilities of a Marine Park | | | | |
| Activity 1.1.1: Implement awareness raising and extension strategy specifically on marine resource conservation and alternative livelihood issues (at local level). | Study and exchange visits for local community to other protected areas within and outside the region | Rationale is to increase informed (first hand) experience of MPAs and their benefits among Park residents. (A critical element will be the facilitation of follow-up with the participants sharing their experiences with the greater community on their return) - Study visit and follow-up conducted. | 6,000.00 | 7,000.00 |
| | Follow-up with participants | Check that feed-back is made and monitor its results | 1,000.00 | |
| Outcome 1.2. Promote lessons learned regionally and internationally | | | | |
| Activity 1.2.1.: Prepare material that MBREMP and others can share at the international level | Prepare technical reports and publications | Increase awareness and raise the status of the area at all levels - Relevant material prepared | 6,000.00 | 12,000.00 |
| Activity 1.2.2.: Support to MBREMP staff to share experiences and lessons learnt at the international level | Study tours, workshops/seminars | Increase the exposure of staff to problems and solutions as part of building "best practice" knowledge - Study tours conducted reports submitted for future reference | 6,000.00 | |
| Outcome 1.3.: Participatory environmental, resources and socio-economic monitoring system supported and strengthened | | | | |
| Activity 1.3.1: Monitoring program (MOMS) reviewed and refined, based on identified needs and gaps Activity 1.3.2: Strengthen and support capacity for participatory monitoring and evaluation Activity 1.3.3.: Engage Secondary schools students in monitoring activities (Honorary Scientists) | Develop further required modules, Indicators and key criteria from the originally identified list. Training Workshops for staff and community representatives on new modules and techniques | Indicators and criteria developed for new Modules - field materials developed, training provided and the modules implemented. Annual audit by a competent evaluator (Consultancy) | 6,000.00 | 12,000.00 |
| | Training workshop for secondary school students on monitoring techniques | Staff trained | 3,000.00 | |
| | | Secondary school students engaged and trained on various monitoring techniques | 3,000.00 | |
| RESULT Area 2: Park Management Plan under implementation with externalities addressed | | | | |
| Outcome 2.1: Implementation | | | | |

Tanzania Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Project (MBREMP) : TERMINAL EVALUATION

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|-------------------|-------------------|
| Activity 2.1.1: Support for continued Transboundary conservation negotiations | Continue discussion with relevant institutions. Develop strategies and necessary mechanisms. | Consensus reached, and implementation of Transboundary conservation | 10,000.00 | |
| Activity 2.1.2: Zonation (Implementation of park User Zones) | Support to purchase of marker buoys, anchors and accessories. | Zones clearly marked for identification by Park users | 30,000.00 | 40,000.00 |
| RESULT Area 3: AIG and sustainable use activities are researched, developed, piloted and adopted | | | | |
| Outcome 3.1: Pilot AIG activities identified, designed and tested | | | | |
| Activity 3.1.2: Support for the more successful existing AIG innovations and options (Expansion of those identified with potential to levels where they can benefit from economies of scale) | Assess piloted options (Fish farming, Crab-fattening, Bee Keeping, Improved Cashew production and Off-shore fishing) | Consultancies to undertake value chain analysis and develop suitable business plans and a suitable Micro-finance scheme for the development of these AIG's in Park villages. | 9,000.00 | |
| | Establish the Micro-finance scheme with initial seed funding; to allow for the purchase of start-up materials and equipment for beneficiaries. | Micro-finance Scheme and initial SME s established | 10,000.00 | |
| | Facilitate improved cashewnut production. (As per the existing NUSSURA co-operative the establishment of a second project in the Park area) | Facilitation provided (Grant funding obtained from other outside source) | 2,000.00 | |
| | Support and enlarge Pilot Offshore fishing activity (Explore Alternative Technologies - Longlines and FADs) | Offshore fishing pilot programme supported, monitored and reviewed | 30,000.00 | 51,000.00 |
| RESULT Area 4: Project effectively managed, monitored and evaluated | | | | |
| Outcome 4.1: Project equipment and facilities are acquired and maintained. | | | | |
| Activity 4.1.1: Establish Park infrastructure Activity 4.1.2: Office Operating Costs (Relevant to this project implementation) Activity 4.1.3 Equipment Operating Costs (Relevant to this project implementation) | Establish secondary infrastructure (Garage, Store rooms and 2 Staff Housing) at Ruvula Field Base. (Supervision Costs for Total Construction Project including Office building funded by MACEMP) | Construction of Secondary infrastructure supported, to ease/facilitate operational activities. Supervisory services provided for total infrastructure development - Infrastructure developed | 50,000.00 | |
| | Procurement of various Office Stationary, and equipment. | Office Stationery procured, and services facilitated | 4,000.00 | |
| | Maintenance of Equipment & Operating costs | Project equipment Maintained. | 18,000.00 | 72,000.00 |
| Outcome 4.2: Administration and support costs consolidated | | | | |
| Activity 4.2.1 Honorary Wardens & Rangers | Support to implementation of Park activities by Supporting Current and Increased Honorary Rangers and Wardens levels and capacity (Training, workshops, uniform or identification and essential equipment) | Implementation supported | 6,000.00 | 6,000.00 |
| | Total Costs | | 200,000.00 | 200,000.00 |

SUMMARY:

Main Areas of continued support:

1. AIGs support to the development of clear Value Chain Analyses and Business plans for the following AIGs

- Bee-keeping and Honey production
- Finfish farming
- Crab fattening

Development of a suitable Micro-credit scheme

Support for purchase of start-up materials and equipment for beneficiaries on a loan basis. This will form part of the fund of the Micro-credit scheme.

2. Support for the on-going Biological Monitoring Programme MOMS

3. Support for the process of development of a Trans-boundary MPA

4. Supervisory services for the Total Park Infrastructure Development and provision of the field supporting infrastructures

5. Support for continued capacity building of Park staff and community members to implement biodiversity conservation and monitoring activities

COMMENT:

Despite progress made in the original funded project period, there remains a certain amount of consolidation necessary to achieve and maximize the project outcomes.