



Sociedade para a Reserva do Niassa



# **END OF FIRST PHASE PROJECT EVALUATION**

**FINAL REPORT 08.09.05**

## **NIASSA RESERVE COMMUNITY-BASED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (CBNRM) PROJECT**

Funded by NORAD and WWF Norway; Contract MZ 000091

PROJECT No.: GLO-02/467-3

through

WWF Southern African Regional Office (SARPO)

and WWF Mozambique Country Office (MCO)

**Report by Brian T. B. Jones<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> Independent Consultant. PO Box 9455, Eros, Windhoek, Namibia. Tel. & Fax: +264 61 237101. E-mail: [bjones@mweb.com.na](mailto:bjones@mweb.com.na)

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the staff of the WWF MCO for their efficient work in arranging the logistics for my visit to the Niassa Reserve, including several changes to the schedule at short notice. Thanks are also due to the SRN staff at Mbatamila who hosted me and made my stay there very comfortable. The Project Team need to be acknowledged for their patience and willingness to put up with a barrage of questions, often repeated, and their assistance in helping me to understand the particular circumstances of the Niassa Reserve and the people living within it. Special thanks to Antonio Serra for getting us safely to all the meetings in remote areas and across difficult terrain and for his companionship on the long journey from Mbatamila, through Negomano to Pemba.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
List of Acronyms	4
Executive summary	5
1. Introduction	7
2. Background	8
3. Project Design	12
4. Impacts and Achievements	20
5. Implementation Strategy	39
6. Monitoring and Evaluation	41
7. Lessons Learned	42
8. Recommendations	43
References and Documents Consulted	52
Annex 1. List of Persons Consulted	54
Annex 2. Original Logical Framework	55
Annex 3. Summary of Recommendations from the March 2004	
Mid-Term Review	58
Annex 4. List of Project Documents	60
Annex 5. Terms of Reference	61
Table 1. Suggested Modifications to Indicators made by the Mid-term Review	17
Table 2. Training Events and Number of Participants	27

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

CBO	Community-based Organisation
CBNRM	Community-based Natural Resource Management
DNAC	National Directorate of Conservation Areas
DNFFB	National Directorate of Forestry and Wildlife
FFI	Fauna and Flora International
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MTR	Mid-term Review
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NRM	Natural Resource Management
NTFP	Non-timber Forest Products
PA	Protected Area
RUAT	Resource Use Assessment
SPFFB	Provincial Government agency for Wildlife and Forestry
SRN	Society for the Development and Management of the Niassa Reserve
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature
WWF MCO	WWF Mozambique Coordination Office
WWF SARPO	WWF Southern Africa Regional Office

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The WWF Niassa Community-based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) Project was designed as a pilot project to assist the Niassa Reserve authorities to find ways of addressing the management issues that arise from the presence of more than 20 00 people living within the reserve. The project began in late 2001 and ends in December 2005. It is funded by NORAD and implemented by WWF Norway and the WWF Southern Africa Regional Office (SARPO), through the WWF Mozambique Coordination Office (MCO) in conjunction with the management authority of the reserve, the Society for the Development and Management of the Niassa Reserve (SRN).

The project experienced problems in its early stages due to problems in recruiting experienced staff, funding delays, personality clashes between the first project team leader and the reserve warden, and differences in interpretation about how the project should be implemented. The original design of the project was based on the assumption that there would be considerable revenue sharing between the reserve and resident communities of income from safari hunting and tourism. However the income from safari hunting has been less than envisaged and tourism has yet to develop in the reserve. As a result the project needed to re-orient itself towards income generation activities based on harvesting of natural resources such as fish and honey.

The design was guided heavily by experiences in the southern African region on community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) which focuses on community rights over natural resources and incentives for communities to sustainably manage these resources. However, to some extent the project has also had to re-orient itself to working within a somewhat different context and set of issues – that of communities living within a protected area. The project started at a time when the reserve management authority had no clear policy on addressing problems associated with communities resident in the reserve. SRN has adopted an experimental approach to community engagement and the project has had to adjust its implementation approach in line with that of SRN.

The project has managed to emerge from its early problems. Since late 2003 and latterly under a new team leader it has begun to find focus and to achieve some concrete results. Progress has been made in improving the attitude of people in the focal communities towards the reserve and its management staff. A start has been made in developing natural resource-based income generating activities (honey and fishing), on supporting resource user groups and strengthening Natural Resource Committees. Considerable progress has been made on helping communities deal with human/wildlife conflict through support to erecting and maintaining electric fences and the establishment of chilli pepper fences to deter elephants from raiding crop fields. However, progress over the first half of 2005 was constrained by two factors. First, the level of funding received at the start of the year does not leave much for implementation after salaries. Second, flash floods destroyed a bridge cutting off two of the focal villages for several months.

The good progress made since late 2004 warrants the continuation of the project into a second phase but with some adjustments. To close the project now would lead to the dashing of hopes and expectations of villagers and a return to negative attitudes about the reserve. The next phase should be transitional towards a transfer of community conservation activities to SRN with a focus on strengthening the SRN capacity to implement community conservation. It should focus on the following areas or Outputs under the existing goal and immediate objective:

- a) Institutional support to community NR resource committees and resource user groups. This would include strengthening the representativeness and accountability of the NR committees; legalisation of committees in order to receive the 20% state revenue share; organisational strengthening of NR committees and user groups; financial management training; support for negotiating co-management agreements with SRN and potentially the private sector; and support for deciding how to use income from revenue sharing and for accounting for this revenue. HIV/AIDS and the involvement of women have received little attention in the first phase. These aspects should be addressed as part of the overall component of institutional support to communities. The project should try to partner with an organisation that specialises in HIV/AIDS issues rather than trying to implement activities itself.
- b) Capacity building to the Reserve community conservation team, particularly the proposed new SRN staff, including short courses, exposure visits and access to relevant literature.
- c) Support to income generation activities such as honey gathering, fishing and chilli production, including developing links to markets, micro-financing, and the identification of other income generation activities. If tourism starts to develop within the reserve and park policies allow for community concessions for campsites and/or lodges, then the project would provide support to communities in this area.
- d) Support to sustainable management of land and natural resources by local communities: this would include sustainable harvesting of honey and fish and any other resources for commercial use; addressing human/wildlife conflict; development of local resource use and regulations in conjunction with the reserve authorities; promotion of conservation farming; local land use planning; fire management; and, if emerging reserve policies allow, wildlife quota setting for own use and wildlife monitoring;

SRN is holding a meeting in early September to further clarify its policy and approach to co-management of the reserve. This framework is crucial for guiding how the project can support community conservation in the reserve. Any design of a new phase has to be sufficiently flexible to be able to respond to the policy and strategy being developed by SRN.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Purpose of the Report

The WWF Niassa Community-based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) Project was designed as a pilot to help the Niassa Reserve authorities gain experience that would assist them in addressing the management issues that arise from the presence of more than 20 00 people living within the reserve. The project was intended to identify which activities were most appropriate to the legal and socio-economic environment of the reserve, and to inform the future decisions of the reserve authorities in terms of community policy and field approach. The project began in late 2001 and ends in December 2005. It is funded by NORAD and implemented by WWF Norway and the WWF Southern Africa Regional Office (SARPO), through the WWF Mozambique Coordination Office (MCO) in conjunction with the management authority of the reserve, the Society for the Development and Management of the Niassa Reserve (SRN). This report is the result of an evaluation of the first phase of the project carried out between July 19 and July 29, 2005. The primary purpose of the evaluation was to assess the impact, effectiveness and relevance of the project in relation to its objectives, target groups, partners and other affected parties, and to assess project results. A secondary purpose was to examine the extent to which the project had carried out the recommendations of an internal Mid-term Review which took place in March 2004. A further aim of the evaluation was to make recommendations for the continuation or otherwise of the project. The full Terms of Reference for the evaluation are contained in Annex 5.

## 1.2 Methodology

In order to carry out the evaluation, project documents including progress reports and relevant documents from other sources were consulted (see List of References and Documents Consulted). Interviews were carried out with key stakeholders including local communities living within the reserve, reserve management staff, the WWF project team and local government officials. A meeting was held with the project team to examine the extent to which the recommendations of the March 2004 Mid-term Review (MTR) were implemented and to analyse progress against the logical framework indicators. A full list of persons consulted is contained in Annex 1. A schedule of activities for the evaluation is contained in the TOR in Annex 5. This schedule was amended slightly to enable the consultant to provide feedback at the end of the evaluation to the Director of SRN, and the head of the WWF Mozambique Coordination Office (MCO). A draft evaluation report was circulated for comments and a final report compiled based on the comments received.

## 2. BACKGROUND

### 2.1 History of the Reserve

The Niassa Reserve is situated in the Niassa Province in Northern Mozambique and its northern boundary follows the international border with Tanzania. Some reports suggest that during the 1930s the Portuguese colonial government created a hunting reserve which had similar boundaries to the present-day reserve (Wiinblad 2003). However, the first documented designation of the reserve took place in 1954. Since then the reserve has gone through a number of boundary adjustments and changes in status (SRN 2003, Wiinblad 2003). In 1969 the reserve was reduced to an area of just more than 12 000 sq. km. In 1995 the government entered into a contract with a private company, Grupo Madal, for the management of the reserve based on a *de facto* recognition of considerably extended boundaries. This situation was consolidated in 1999 when a Ministerial decree defined and legalised the current boundaries of a core conservation area (22 924 sq. km.) and a surrounding buffer zone consisting of hunting blocks (19 240 sq. km.). The status of the reserve was upgraded from “Partial Reserve” to “National Reserve”. Map 1 shows the current boundaries of the reserve.

In 1998 the Council of Ministers approved the creation of a joint venture between the state and the private sector in the form of the company, the Society for the Development and Management of the Niassa Reserve (SRN). The articles of association for this joint venture were published in the government gazette in 2000. The state has a 51% holding in SRN and a private sector company, Investimentos do Niassa has a holding of 49%. SRN has a lease for the management of the reserve which runs for 10 years, expiring in 2012 as the lease agreement was only signed in 2002. SRN is currently re-negotiating an extension of the lease for a further 25 years.

SRN (2003) identifies two main phases in the recent development of the reserve. The first phase from 1995 to 1998 defined the model of a partnership between the private sector and the government, with the participation of communities, for the management of the reserve. During this phase two management plans were written and expatriate wardens and game scouts were employed. At this stage the agreement was between the government and Grupo Madal. Much of the financing for this stage came from owner of Grupo Madal, a Norwegian businessman, Halvor Astrup. The second phase from 1998 saw the development of the joint venture organisation SRN, the appointment of a Mozambican Warden, the appointment of a Mozambican director of SRN, the development of safari hunting in the buffer zone, an expansion of the game scouts, the development of and subsequent revision of another management plan, and the development of the WWF CBNRM project. SRN is being supported by a number of donor organisations as well as the international conservation NGO, Fauna and Flora International (FFI). This organisation raises financial resources to support reserve management, technical assistance in management and community development and coordination of various surveys. The core area of the reserve is managed directly by

SRN, while responsibility for managing the buffer zone lies with the hunting concessionaires, under the overall supervision of SRN.

Most of the reserve consists of *miombo* woodland interspersed with seasonally wet grassy depressions or *dambos* and drier areas of bush savanna in the larger and lower lying river valleys. The landscape is scattered with granite *inselbergs* and riverine vegetation fringes the rivers and streams. The reserve covers about a third of the Niassa Province and all of Mecula District and most of Mavago District fall within the reserve. The human population of the reserve is estimated at 23 000, about half of whom live in settlements within the core area, including the administrative centre of Mecula with a population of around 4 500. The people within Niassa Province are among the poorest in Mozambique.

## 2.2 Policy and Legal Framework

The Forestry and Wildlife Act (No. 10 of 1999) defines a National Reserve as an area of total protection. The Act states that National Reserves are subject to the same prohibitions as National Parks, which include game hunting, forest, agriculture and mining exploration (sic) and any activity that tends to modify the land aspect or vegetation characteristics. However, the Act also states that “resources that are found at the national reserves may be used, subject to licensing, under terms to be regulated, provided that it does not infringe the specific objectives that dictated their creation and that it conforms to the management plan” (GOM 1999: 10). The Act stipulates that management of national parks and protected areas has to be carried out in accordance with a management plan that has to be drafted with the participation of local communities (article 10.5). The Act makes provision for the use of forest and wildlife resources by local communities for own consumption in certain areas outside National Parks and National Reserves, but not within their boundaries.

The position of the local communities living inside protected areas in Mozambique remains ambiguous. Although legislation can be read as preventing local communities from carrying out many livelihood activities within national parks and national reserves, the English translation of the Forest and Wildlife Act does not refer in any way to people living within a reserve. The main prohibition in the Act that would appear to prevent settlement and agriculture in a reserve is that on “any activity that tends to modify the land aspect or vegetation characteristics”.

Nearly all protected areas (PAs) in Mozambique have people living within their boundaries. The current government policy is to promote voluntary resettlement of people from PAs, but not to implement forced removals. Further, people resettled should be compensated with adequate land, resources and services to compensate them for what they have left behind. So far this approach is only being implemented in the Greater Limpopo Transfrontier Park where there is sufficient donor funding to pay for resettlement. To a large extent, people living in PAs in Mozambique are in a form of legal limbo. Their presence in the PAs is accepted by government, but they are unable to gain the land rights other communities on communal land are entitled to under the land

law of 1997, most of their activities are probably illegal and their development options are severely restricted. The government, with the support of the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation, is planning to design a new conservation policy for Mozambique which will include a specific section regarding people living within protected areas (Isabel Macie *pers. comm.*).

With specific regard to Niassa, SRN follows the government policy of not implementing forced resettlements. As funds are not available for implementing a proper voluntary resettlement, SRN accepts that for some time to come, and perhaps for always, people will remain within the reserve (Rodrigues *pers. comm.*). However, SRN favours restricting further development of infrastructure and services within the core area and promoting development in and outside the buffer zone in the hope that people will be attracted away from the core area to development on the periphery. SRN also hopes that such an approach will help to reduce the population of Mecula, which is situated next to Mecula Mountain, an area identified as being the reserve's most important biodiversity 'hotspot' and within the part of the reserve with the highest concentration of elephants. SRN has adopted the stance that local people should have the right to subsistence use of natural resources within the reserve in accordance with the reserve management plan. Further, SRN and the Government are applying the provisions of a government decree that local communities should receive 20% of state revenue from exploitation of forest and wildlife resources. SRN has in the past distributed 20% of the concession fees paid by safari operators for the hunting blocks in the reserve buffer zone and the state will in future distribute 20% of the licence fees it receives from the same safari operators. If photographic tourism is developed in the reserve, then there is potential for the income to communities to increase through gaining a share of concession fees for lodges and mobile operators.

### 2.3 Project History

The SRN-WWF CBNRM project in Niassa Reserve was designed in 2000 to address the problems created for reserve management by the presence of people living within the reserve. The design was carried out through consulting key stakeholders including SRN and government officials and was based on SRN's Programme Strategy that was developed in 1998. The design drew heavily from experiences in the implementation of CBNRM activities on communal lands outside protected areas in the southern African region. The project was late in starting due to funding and recruitment constraints during its inception phase. As a result field implementation only began in April 2002. From April 2002 to mid 2003 the project was characterised by a lack of clarity in translating project design to viable implementation, by a lack of adequate reporting and communications, and a crisis of trust (Anstey *et al* 2004). From late 2003 to early 2004 there was an improvement in implementation as trust and confidence between individuals and organisations improved, work planning improved and more focused activities with communities began to be implemented (Anstey *et al* 2004). An internal Mid-term Review (MTR) was carried out in March 2004 that recommended a more focused implementation approach concentrating on carrying out detailed village resource use

surveys (RUATs), capacity building of village institutions and income generation. A summary of the recommendations of the MTR is provided in Annex 3

## 2.4 Special Circumstances

### *Communications and Infrastructure*

The SRN-WWF Niassa CBNRM Project is not being implemented in easy circumstances. The reserve is situated in a remote part of a country that has poor infrastructure and weak government services as a result of decades of war for independence, a subsequent civil war and resulting economic decline. The roads in and around the reserve, even those to neighbouring small towns, are little more than bush tracks subject to frequent wash-aways and infrequent maintenance. This situation has important implications for project implementation. In order to have a vehicle serviced or repaired might take a return journey of a week or more. During this time field implementation is constrained not only by the lack of the vehicle, but by the absence of one of the team members. Heavy rains during the wet season render some parts of the reserve inaccessible for several months of the year. The first visit of 2005 by the project team to two of the project's focal villages, Naulala and Negomano, only took place in June because a bridge across a river washed away during the wet season flood.

Communications are also a problem because of the remoteness of the reserve. The project team depends upon the system of "bushmail" – e-mail by radio waves – for its communication with the outside world. It is not easy to obtain a connection to the "bushmail" and when a connection is made, connections are often severed before messages can be sent and only very short messages without attachments can be transmitted.

### *An evolving system of co-management*

Mozambique's situation of having large numbers of people living within its protected areas, while not unique, is certainly unusual in southern Africa. Similar examples in the southern African region are rare. Namibia has resident people in two of its parks but has yet to adequately address the problems that arise from this situation. The Richtersveld National Park in South Africa has a small number of people living inside its boundaries with whom the conservation authority has a contract for the rental of the land and for collaborative management of the park. Otherwise PAs within the region do not have people within their boundaries (although recently as part of the land reform upheavals in Zimbabwe some people have moved into parks such as Gonarezhou).

As a result there are few experiences within the region that can assist WWF, SRN and the Mozambican Government to design policies and approaches that suit the particular circumstances of Niassa. The main experiences in collaborative (or "co-") management in protected areas between conservation agencies and resident people are to be found

elsewhere in countries such as Australia and Canada (West and Brechin 1991). SRN therefore has found itself trying to develop policies and approaches to working with the people living within the Niassa Reserve with little experience from within the region to draw on and an ambiguous, but evolving national policy and legislative environment. This situation has led to a considerable amount of experimentation by SRN with different approaches to community participation and benefit. Wiinblad (2003) found that such experimentation and a lack of a defined strategy was creating insecurity among the communities. It probably also causes a degree of confusion for a number of different stakeholders including district government officials.

The project is trying to implement activities with local communities in a context of an evolving system of co-management based on experimentation and adaptation to government policy and legislation that is also evolving. This context provides significant challenges to the project team in trying to meet the changing needs of the reserve management authority and the shifting requirements of legislation. In a nutshell, within the confines of conventional project design frameworks, what has been required in Niassa, and will be for some time to come, is a considerable degree of flexibility in implementation.

### 3. PROJECT DESIGN

#### 3.1 Original Project Design

The original project design (contained in the Project Document, November 2002) contained the following elements:

##### **Development Objective (or Goal):**

*“Local communities benefit from and maintain habitats and numbers of selected wildlife species in Niassa Reserve and the Buffer Zones in Mozambique”*

##### Indicators:

- By 2005, at least 1030 HH living in Naulala, Mussoma, and Negomano receive cash benefits of USD 10/HH/Year or more from wildlife and NRM activities
- Benefits (cash, kind, community projects) from natural resource and/or wildlife utilisation are being realised and increasing at district and sub-district (village) level
- The area of wildlife habitat and numbers of selected species in particular endemic and/or endangered species, within sites managed by CBOs occur at densities at least equivalent to those present at the outset of the project, and that the number and size of key habitats has not declined as compared to 2001; Quality of habitat e.g. intact woodland remains unchanged as compared to 2001
- Access to and availability of key natural resources for HH in project sites remains unchanged as compared to 2001 levels
- As spillover effect, CBNRM activities are initiated in Nthimbu and other villages by communities cover an additional 500 HH

**Immediate objective or purpose:**

*“Community-based organisations are actively managing natural resources in conjunction with the management authority in Niassa Reserve and the Buffer Zones.”*

Indicators:

- By 2002, at least 1 community leader representing the 3 project sites participates in SRN Board Meetings
- By 2005, at least 1 CBO from each of the 3 selected project sites regularly carry out consultations at community level on NRM activities and, in coordination with the management authority conduct planning exercises, oversee implementation and participate in M&E
- CBOs make investments in cash and kind in NRM infrastructure and activities e.g. fence maintenance, trading facilities for NRM products such as honey and guinea fowls etc.)
- By 2005, the number of reported illegal uses of land, wildlife and other resources in the 3 project sites declines to 20% of levels of baseline information in 2001

**Output 1 NRM knowledge and skills of CBO leaders, resource managers and others at provincial and District level improved**

**Activities:**

- 1.1 Undertake training needs assessment (Provincial, District, SRN)
- 1.2 Develop training program based on identified needs (e.g. Institutional management, Literacy training, Community Project Management, Problem Animal Management, Land Use Planning etc.)
- 1.3 Develop training materials and adapt existing WWF-SARPO materials for Mozambique
- 1.4 Coordinate training with local training institutions (DNFFB) in the NRM field
- 1.5 Implement training programme
- 1.6 Monitor and evaluate training programme

Indicators

- By 2005, at least 15 CBO leaders (5 from each of the 3 selected sites) are trained in at least 3 NRM methodologies, namely Problem Animal Management, Project Management and Resource Assessment & Monitoring; the leaders register a qualitative improvement in each area within their communities in accordance with criteria based on needs assessment
- By 2005, key resource management personnel in the Reserve (SRN) and at District and Provincial levels (2+16+4) will know aims and strategies of Niassa Reserve, the role of wildlife as a land use, and have general exposure to land use planning tools, problem animal management and fire management
- District Administrators actively supporting the project, especially in situations of crisis

## **Output 2 Community based organisations reviewed, developed and established**

### **Activities:**

- 2.1 Carry out participatory analysis of community institutions (rules for NR use)
- 2.2 conduct participatory analysis of community organisations through PRA
- 2.3 Develop and establish through meetings and workshops appropriate organisations and institutions for NRM
- 2.4 Provide training
- 2.5 Encourage communities to undertake activities and monitor (PAC reporting, electric fence maintenance, manage wildlife revenue etc.)
- 2.6 Regularly evaluate process of institutional development and provide support where needed

### Indicators

- By 2005, at least 3 Resource management committees in each of the 3 villages covering such resources as fisheries, wildlife, beekeeping, timber and non-timber products are created through a participatory process, with responsibilities assigned to each member; these are able to perform up to 80% of the tasks as established in the TOR agreed by the communities

## **Output 3 Participatory land use planning, zonation, and appropriate NRM options examined, selected and developed**

### **Activities:**

- 3.1 Identify constraints and opportunities to land use options and zonation
- 3.2 Undertake baseline surveys and complete information gaps necessary for zonation
- 3.3 Undertake NR surveys (Wildlife, Forestry, Fishery, Beekeeping, Water)
- 3.4 Develop broad zonation with SRN and District level inputs
- 3.5 Secure zonation plan acceptance at local level
- 3.6 Develop local level (community/village) land use plans within broad zonation plan
- 3.7 Identify problems and issues relating to NRM options (e.g. bee-keeping, fisheries, timber, eco-tourism etc.)

### Indicators

- By 2005, zonation of Niassa Reserve for conservation and NRM proposed by SRN is fully endorsed and supported by all stakeholders
- By 2003, at least 3 community level resource management options (e.g. fishing, beekeeping, tourism) are identified and developed in the 3 selected project sites by members of interest groups and implemented by 2005

## **Output 4 Revenue sharing mechanisms developed and implemented**

### **Activities:**

- 4.1 Examine options for revenue sharing
- 4.2 Develop revenue sharing agreements using participatory techniques
- 4.3 Negotiate agreements on use of revenue
- 4.4 Provide training
- 4.5 Implement revenue sharing and use agreements

### Indicators

- By 2003, revenue sharing agreements for at least 3 resources (e.g. wildlife, fisheries and timber) are reached through a participatory process involving all stakeholders and are being used as a tool for revenue distribution in the 3 selected project sites

## **Output 5 Regulations for the use and management of natural resources developed and approval secured**

### **Activities:**

- 5.1 Analyse existing regulations for access to NR
- 5.2 Carry out participatory analysis of traditional resource rights
- 5.3 Formulate new regulations for NRM by CBOs
- 5.4 If required, seek approval from relevant authorities and adopt agreed regulations
- 5.5 Monitor enforcement of new regulations by CBOs and SRN
- 5.6 Review regulations and update/revise if necessary

### Indicators

- By 2003, regulations for hunting, agriculture, immigration, fishing and the use of timber (fuelwood, charcoal, building) have been developed jointly by CBOs and SRN and adopted by the Board and (if required) submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture for approval

## **Output 6 Collaborative project management functioning**

### **Activities:**

- 6.1 Recruit project personnel
- 6.2 Provide training as required to new project personnel
- 6.3 Maintain public relations and disseminate information to all stakeholders and public
- 6.4 Procure and deliver goods and services
- 6.5 Hold regular meetings
- 6.6 Maintain accounts and financial reports
- 6.7 Submit joint (SRN/WWF) project progress reports
- 6.8 Carry out annual reviews and revise work plans
- 6.9 Organise and coordinate external visits
- 6.10 Undertake exchange visits to other CBNRM projects
- 6.11 Organise/coordinate mid-term external evaluation/review

## Indicators

- All narrative and financial reports produced in time and submitted to appropriate offices by Project Partners
- Bi-annual reports by Project Executant, Niassa and the Director of the Reserve reflect agreement in at least 90% of the issues from day 1
- Conflicts and contradictions arising in the Project Team in the Reserve are locally resolved without reference to the SRN Board or WWF SARPO

### 3.2 Changes Recommended by Mid-term Review

The Mid-term Review (MTR) carried out during March 2004 concluded that despite implementation problems in the first 18 months of the project the problems were not a result of faulty project design. The MTR found that the project document remained a suitable basis for implementing and completing the project objectives. “None of those directly involved in the project suggested the need for a new Project Document-design-strategy-contract and a general conclusion of this review would be that the past ‘crisis’ was not due to a faulty Project Document or its key elements, but due to the failure to adhere to it or use it” (Anstey *et al* 2003: 13).

However, the MTR did have some comments to make about specific aspects of the design, particularly some of the indicators. The MTR noted for example, that assumptions about receipt of household income from sources such as trophy hunting and tourism were no longer valid and recommended that this indicator should be dropped from the logical framework. A summary of the recommended changes to indicators is provided in Table 1.

Since the MTR, the project has not taken steps to formally revise the original logical framework either as a result of the implementation experiences of the project team or as a result of the recommendations of the MTR.

### 3.3 Changes to Implementation as a Result of the Mid-term Review

Although the project logical framework has not been formally revised to reflect the changes recommended by the MTR, there *has* been a re-orientation of implementation focus based on the recommendations of the MTR. Training activities under Output 1 gained more focus through concentrating on training for electric fence maintenance and on the use of chilli fences to keep elephants away from crops.

Under Output 3 less attention has been given to local level land use planning and zoning because these activities needed to await the completion of the evolving reserve management plan. The focus of activities under this output shifted to carrying out RUATs and understanding local resource use and resource use areas.

**Table 1. Suggested Modifications to Indicators made by the MTR**

(Source: Mid-term Internal Progress Review 2004)

ISSUE	INDICATOR REVISION	NOTES
<b>Development Objective</b>	Key indicator of the 4 in the Log frame should be ‘benefits (cash, kind, community projects) from natural resource and/or wildlife utilisation are being realised and increasing at district and sub-district (village) level’	The indicator in the log frame relating to individual household <u>cash</u> benefits of USD 10 plus is no longer a valid one due to changes to external factors (SRN income from hunting).
<b>Immediate Objective</b>	Remove the indicator ‘by 2002, at least 1 community leader representing the 3 project sites participates in SRN Board Meetings’	This indicator is no longer valid due to changes in external factors – SRN has not undertaken the underlying mechanism to establish community representatives on the Board.
<b>Outputs</b>	<p>Suggest transfer the following Output 3 indicator to Output 4 – ‘by 2003, at least 3 community level resource management options (e.g. fishing, beekeeping, tourism) are identified and developed in the 3 selected project sites by members of interest groups and implemented by 2005’</p> <p>Add indicator to Output 6 to validate evidence of a close partnership/integration of team in overall Reserve functioning ‘the Team Leader acts as temporary substitute Reserve officer in absence of SRN senior staff’</p>	Suggested re-focusing between Outputs 3 and 4 - the implementation of NRM options (eg beekeeping) fits in Output 4 (rather than mixed between Output 3 and 4) and indicators should be shifted accordingly.

As recommended by the MTR, activities under Output 4 shifted from a focus on revenue sharing and more towards local level income generation activities such as honey sales and fishing and the investigation of other options. In terms of revenue sharing project activities focused on assisting communities to prepare for the receipt of the 20% share of reserve income distributed by SRN. Under Output 5 the focus has shifted away from formulation of new regulations for NRM by local CBOs towards enabling local people to understand the Land, Forest and Wildlife laws. Again, the development of local rules for resource use depends largely on the finalisation of the reserve management plan and the development of an overall reserve policy towards people living within the reserve.

### 3.4 Assessment of Project Design

#### *CBNRM or Co-management?*

Although the MTR concluded that there was no need for a redesign of the project, there are some issues regarding the design that need addressing, particularly with regard to the implications for the design of another phase. The most important issue is that a number of key stakeholders perceive that the design was based to a large extent on a “classic” CBNRM approach that was rooted in giving rights to local communities to manage their own resources outside a protected area. This perception is held for example by the SRN Director, the WWF MCO Head and the Project Team Leader. This perception partly arose because the project was largely based on CBNRM principles (see page 15 of the Project Document for example). Further, in the early stages of the project, the team apparently told local people that the resources belonged to the communities, a CBNRM principle, which did not accord with the actual situation in the reserve. (This is an interpretation and implementation problem, not necessarily a design fault).

Examination of the activities under the Outputs shows that the design at least implicitly recognises the limitations on the authority of communities to manage land and resources because they are living within the reserve. For example Output 3 does take into account the need for local zonation to fit in with a broader land use zonation developed by SRN. Output 5 recognises that any locally developed rules for NRM need to be approved by the SRN Board. However, perhaps if the design had been more explicit about the co-management nature of the project context the early interpretation and implementation problems might not have arisen. A more explicit recognition of the co-management nature of the community activities could have given the project team more guidance in the early stages of implementation.

Assessment: A key evaluation finding is that the design of the project needed to more explicitly recognise that the Outputs and Activities should reflect a context of evolving co-management between the reserve authorities and local communities living within the reserve. (This statement is made with the recognition that the evaluator and other stakeholders are drawing this conclusion with 20/20 hindsight whereas the project design team was trying to predict what would be required in the absence of an existing framework for co-management). It is recommended that the next phase of the project

should be explicitly oriented towards developing and supporting co-management arrangements between the reserve authorities, local communities and other stakeholders such as district government.

### *Policy framework for addressing community and co-management issues*

The second important design issue is the lack of a clear framework for co-management referred to above. This meant that the design team had to try to anticipate the needs of the reserve management with regard to interactions and relationships with resident people. As the SRN approach has evolved over the first phase of the project, some of the planned activities became less relevant. Particularly in the view of SRN, there was a need for the project to be more flexible so that it could adapt to changing circumstances and be more relevant to SRN needs (Rodrigues *pers. comm.*). Clearly a balance needs to be found between evolution and experimentation and working according to a clear framework. Some form of framework is required for the project to be sure that it is meeting the needs of SRN and for project staff to have guidance for their planning and implementation of activities.

Assessment: For the next phase the project needs to be working under a clear SRN policy and strategy that can shape the design and guide the implementation activities of the project team. If SRN can set clear objectives for what it wants to achieve regarding co-management with local communities and other stakeholders then the project can be designed to help achieve these objectives. Key issues that need to be addressed by such a policy include:

- The level of community participation in the development of overall policy and objectives of the park (e.g. the development of the management plan) and the extent to which communities should be involved in the approval of these
- The level of community authority to take decisions regarding NRM (e.g. quota setting, regulations for fishing, land use planning, agricultural development etc.)
- The level of community participation in management activities such as game monitoring, anti-poaching, etc.
- The extent to which communities can be directly engaged in tourism activities in order to generate their own income (including gaining concessions, entering into partnerships with the private sector or SRN, etc.)

These are all elements of co-management which need clarifying and for which clear parameters need to be set and agreed upon. If this can be done then a framework will be in place that the project can operate within and support. FFI and SRN are planning to hold a meeting with a number of stakeholders (including WWF) in Niassa Reserve in early September 2005 aimed at developing a policy and strategy for working with the people resident in the reserve. Due to the NORAD project cycle and the need to submit a new project proposal through WWF Norway to NORAD by the end of August, it might be difficult to design the next phase so that it is adequately shaped by the results of the September meeting. Although SRN has given an indication of the approach it would like

to take in future (see sub-section 8.2), it is strongly recommended that WWF does all it can to ensure that the new phase is aligned with the direction provided by the SRN policy that will be in place after September 2005. Recommendations for trying to achieve such an alignment, including some re-orientation of project outputs and activities, are contained in sub-section 8.3.

## 4. IMPACTS AND ACHIEVEMENTS

### 4.1 Analysis of Impacts and Achievements against the Logical Framework and the Recommendations of the MTR

This sub-section considers the extent to which the targets set in the indicators for the Development Objective, the Immediate Objective and the Outputs are being met. It also assesses the extent to which recommendations by the MTR have been implemented in the past year. An overall assessment of progress for each element is provided.

Development Objective: Local communities benefit from and maintain habitats and numbers of selected wildlife species in Niassa Reserve and the Buffer Zones in Mozambique

The following is an assessment of the extent to which the recommendations of the MTR have been implemented:

1. Undertake full RUATs in all 3 villages which must include a) mapping data and status indicators for habitat and selected species (trend analysis); b) household socio-economic data (including breakdowns of cash income)

*Two RUATs, Negomano in October 2004 and Mussoma in December 2004, have been carried out in conjunction with SRN. The third RUAT, at Naulala, could not be carried out as planned during the first half of 2005 because the village was cut off by the destruction of a bridge by a flash flood. However, a considerable amount of relevant data is available from the work carried out by a Danish student at Naulala (Wiinblad 2003). The RUATs gathered information on how people live, carried out trend analyses for various resources and developed local resource use maps. The assessments gathered data on sources of household income but not on income levels.*

2. There is a need to define with SRN the species and habitat baseline data for standardised collation and monitoring basis (e.g. via RUAT process)

*This has not been done.*

Although the development objective is an overall goal to which the project will contribute, some specific indicators were developed to measure progress by the end of this phase of the project in 2005. The following is an assessment of progress towards achieving the targets set by these indicators:

- By 2005, at least 1030 HH living in Naulala, Mussoma, and Negomano receive cash benefits of USD 10/HH/Year or more from wildlife and NRM activities

*As noted in the MTR, this indicator was based largely on the assumption that households would be able to benefit from income based on wildlife use and tourism. As this assumption proved to be incorrect, the project focused more on income-generation activities such as honey and fish sales. Although no baseline data was gathered, the project has collected data on honey sales and there is evidence that as a result of project support for the marketing of honey outside the reserve, better prices were obtained by individuals for their honey (MZM15 000 a litre on the local market in Mecula compared to MZM50 000 a litre when sold in the town of Cuamba). The project is planning to carry out market studies in the second half of 2005 to examine the possibility of improving the sales of honey and fish, as well as the potential for developing markets for other resources.*

- Benefits (cash, kind, community projects) from natural resource and/or wildlife utilisation are being realised and increasing at district and sub-district (village) level

*Benefits from direct project support so far include training to community committees and members (see Output 1), institutional development (see Output 2) which has improved community organisation and capacity for self-help, support for marketing of products such as honey, initial exploration of other income generation activities and improved techniques to combat human/wildlife conflict.*

- The area of wildlife habit and numbers of selected species, in particular endemic and/or endangered species, within sites managed by CBOs occur at densities at least equivalent to those present at the outset of the project, and that the number and size of key habitats has not declined as compared to 2001; Quality of habitat e.g. intact woodland remains unchanged as compared to 2001

*As indicated in the MTR, particular species for monitoring were not selected. Although surveys carried out by SRN contain some of the information that could be used as baseline data, the information has not been extracted as part of a systematic monitoring approach. Nor was it all available in 2001. Further, SRN has yet to determine the extent to which CBOs will have sufficient management authority to influence wildlife numbers and habitat quality. CBOs are still in their infancy and have not yet begun to address broader issues of wildlife management. Their main focus has been on reducing human/wildlife conflict. The incidence of elephant poaching in the reserve has sharply declined in 2005 compared to previous years (Chande pers. comm.) but there is no evidence that this is necessarily a result of changed community attitudes.*

- Access to and availability of key natural resources for HH in project sites remains unchanged as compared to 2001 levels

*Changes in access to and the availability of resources compared to 2001 have not been measured, although some baseline data is contained in the RUATs.*

- As spillover effect, CBNRM activities are initiated in Nthimbu and other villages by communities cover an additional 500 HH

*The original three villages have remained the main focus of project activities.*

Overall Assessment: It is difficult to measure the expected progress towards achieving the Development Objective for three reasons: a) because some of the assumptions made in the design of the project were not accurate; b) because few baseline data have been collected and/or extracted from survey reports in any systematic form; c) re-orientation of project activities to match the actual situation on the ground makes some of the indicators inappropriate. The project team needed to review and revise the indicators in order to match the “new reality” of the implementation circumstances compared to what was anticipated in the project document. Certainly some progress is being made in bringing benefits to local communities, but because it has taken the project team some time to gain direction, these activities are in their infancy and require further development and consolidation.

Immediate Objective or Purpose: Community-based organisations are actively managing natural resources in conjunction with the management authority in Niassa Reserve and the Buffer Zones.

According to the Project Document, the emphasis in the purpose statement is on “active management” by local communities “which requires functioning community-based organisations in the project sites engaged in management activities such as law enforcement, animal census, quota setting etc. Communities must demonstrate that they are increasingly investing time, money and effort in management of natural resources”.

The MTR made specific recommendations regarding activities to achieve the Immediate Objective:

1. Undertake as a priority full RUATs in all 3 villages – for e.g. to allow baseline and retrospective data (trends) on habitats and illegal use

*Two full RUATS have been carried out (see under Development Objective above). However, data has not been extracted and used for M&E purposes.*

2. Emphasise field support activities in the 3 focal villages to NRM options (fishing, beekeeping, quota setting, timber/NTFP etc.) and local NRM institutions (CBOs) such as both NR Committees and specific resource use Associations

*Field support has been directed at beekeeping and fishing in particular as well as capacity building of NR committees and the formation of honey and fishing resource user groups. Quota setting has not been fully addressed. Quotas have been set twice for own-use by communities for community feasts and ceremonies. On the first occasion SRN set the quota and on the second occasion this was done by the communities and traditional leaders. Further, communities do not have their own trophy hunting quotas.*

### 3. Provide emphasis to Negomano settlement field work

*It has been difficult to increase the level of direct project support to Negomano because the village was cut off from the reserve headquarters where the project team is stationed during the wet season. However, the team leader has developed a good working relationship with the district Agriculture Officer at Negomano and provides him with some fuel and other low level support so that the officer can assist the project. The Agriculture Officer provides support to the local NR committees and resource user groups and provides reports on issues such as problem animal incidents to the project team leader.*

The following is an assessment of progress towards reaching the targets set by the indicators for the Immediate Objective.

- By 2002, at least 1 community leader representing the 3 project sites participates in SRN Board Meetings

*SRN has not implemented the original intention of including community members in Board meetings, so as noted in the MTR this indicator is not a significant measure of project success and has become redundant*

- By 2005, at least 1 CBO from each of the 3 selected project sites regularly carry out consultations at community level on NRM activities and, in coordination with the management authority conduct planning exercises, oversee implementation and participate in M&E

*Natural Resource Committees were established by SRN in all three project sites and the project team has continued to give training and support to these committees. In mid-2005 the NR committees in all three communities supported by the project were active, holding meetings, providing feedback to villagers and addressing issues of concern to the communities, particularly human/wildlife conflict. The Mussoma area is the best organised with each village having its own committee operating under an area umbrella committee. This system of local organisation is being used by community leaders to mobilise local residents to build an additional school in a self-help effort. As yet, CBOs are not carrying out planning activities in coordination with the management authority as SRN still has to define the roles and relationships for this type of activity. The NR committees are collecting data on problem animal issues.*

*The project helped SRN to develop a problem animal reporting form, and has provided training in the use of these forms. WWF and SRN are analysing the data to gain a better understanding of the nature and impacts of human/wildlife conflict and to help shape future interventions.*

- CBOs make investments in cash and kind in NRM infrastructure and activities e.g. fence maintenance, trading facilities for NRM products such as honey and guinea fowls etc.)

*Community members are contributing time, labour and materials to activities such as fence construction and maintenance. Some villages are using their share of the 20% of Reserve income distributed by SRN to pay for fence minders.*

- By 2005, the number of reported illegal uses of land, wildlife and other resources in the 3 project sites declines to 20% of levels of baseline information in 2001

*As noted in the MTR “the ability of the project to demonstrate by 2005 an 80% decline in illegal activity, as an indicator of its success, is seriously hampered by the fact that no baseline data (e.g. RUAT) for the project start up period was undertaken” (Anstey et al 2003: 12). It might be added that to expect an 80% decline in such a short period was over optimistic given the time it took to get project activities up and running and the time required to develop and gain legitimacy for new community institutions. Further, the CBNRM approach largely adopted by the project assumed that financial benefits from wildlife would act as an incentive for communities to use resources sustainably and for villagers to refrain from illegal activities. As these financial benefits were not forthcoming, and alternative income generating activities based on other resources are in their infancy, the appropriate incentives for people to desist from illegal activities have not yet been put in place.*

Overall Assessment: Most progress towards the attainment of the Immediate Objective has been in the development and capacity building of community institutions that have the potential for a) managing local natural resources and b) entering into co-management arrangements with SRN. However, SRN still needs to define the scope of the authority of these CBOs to manage wildlife and other resources at the local level and the nature of the co-management arrangements it wishes to enter into with these CBOs. At present the CBOs are dealing mostly with issues of immediate importance to villagers such as human/wildlife conflict and decisions on how to use the income from the revenue sharing by SRN.

#### Output 1. NRM knowledge and skills of CBO leaders, resource managers and others at Provincial and District levels improved

No formal training needs assessment was carried out. However informal meetings on training needs were carried out with the Provincial Directorate of Forestry and Wildlife (SPFFB) and with officials of the Mecula and Mueda districts. The training needs of

community organisations have been identified through the RUATs and in accordance with the priority issues for implementation identified in the RUATs, other community assessments and the MTR. These priority issues are dealing with human/wildlife conflict, income generation and support to community committees. Thus training activities have focused on erection and maintenance of electric fences to keep elephants out of crop fields, the erection of chilli pepper fences for the same purpose, training of committee members in leadership and roles and responsibilities. Table 2 is a record of the training activities carried out by the project.

A number of specific recommendations were made by the MTR regarding this output. The following is an assessment of whether these recommendations were carried out:

1. Implement training programmes based on needs identified in 2004. Translate Fire manual.

*Training activities have been based on needs identified during assessments and field work in 2004. The SARPO Fire Manual has not been translated, but MCO and Project Team leader will follow up with SARPO to get this done before December 2005.*

2. Make wider use of Osborn PAC/Chilli Fence etc. manual plus specify date/actions for new training and demonstration plots in 3 plus villages

*Exposure visits and training on electric fence maintenance and chilli fences was carried out (see Table 2). Demonstration chilli fences have been erected in three settlements at Negomano and one at Mussoma. Project is monitoring effectiveness. Preliminary results show that in some areas the fence was not working because not sufficient chilli had been applied and the rope used was not appropriate. At Negomano villagers report that the chilli fence has been keeping elephants out of their fields. The other method adopted – ‘bombs’ consisting of elephant dung and chilli are working well.*

3. Concentrate on practical field “training of trainers” approach and village follow-up. Not currently useful to revisit formal ‘needs assessment’

*Exposure visits have worked well in raising awareness and acting as training of trainer events, transmitting knowledge from one community to another. Those that attended the exposure visits held their own meetings to disseminate the knowledge and information gained without project support.*

4. Establish a monitoring and evaluation process for the training programme

*This has not been implemented, although the effectiveness of the elephant deterrent methods is being monitored through data collection at the village level and observations by the Project Team.*

The following is an assessment of the extent to which the indicators for Output 1 are being achieved:

- By 2005, at least 15 CBO leaders (5 from each of the 3 selected sites) are trained in at least 3 NRM methodologies, namely Problem Animal Management, Project Management and Resource Assessment & Monitoring; the leaders register a qualitative improvement in each area within their communities in accordance with criteria based on needs assessment

*As shown in Table 2 the specific targets for this indicator have mainly been surpassed. 20 local leaders and members of NR committees have been trained in the roles of community leaders in NRM, 22 NR committee members have been trained in Institutional Management and Elaboration of Small Projects, and 50 community leaders, NR committee members and community members have been trained in various aspects of deterring elephants from raiding crop fields. Although CBO leaders have not been specifically trained in Resource Assessment and Monitoring, they participated in the RUATs in their villages and community members were trained to carry out the RUATs. The second part of this indicator is not clearly defined, particularly with regard to "criteria based on needs assessment", and as a result it is difficult to monitor any progress in this regard.*

- By 2005, key resource management personnel in the Reserve (SRN) and at District and Provincial Levels (2+16+4) will know aims and strategies of Niassa Reserve, the role of wildlife as a land use, and have general exposure to land use planning tools, problem animal and fire management

*It is not clear to what the figures of (2+16+4) refer to. If it is the number of staff at different levels that should be trained, then it would have been better to specify also the positions of the personnel to be trained to give better direction to the project team. However, the project has not specifically targeted training at SRN level, and has tried to involve Provincial and District level personnel. These efforts have not been very successful because provincial level personnel lack transport to attend training events and provincial offices are understaffed. The evaluation schedule did not include the opportunity to meet Provincial Forestry and Wildlife officials due to lack of time so their awareness of the issues specified in the indicator could not be assessed.*

- District Administrators actively supporting the project, especially in situations of crisis

*The evaluator had the opportunity to meet four district level officials (see list of persons consulted) including the Administrator for Mecula District. All four were well-informed about the project, were supportive of its activities and wished to see it continue. No specific crises have occurred to test whether this stated support could be turned into action if necessary. As indicated above, there is a good working*

*relationship between the project and the Agriculture Officer based in Negomano, who provides active support to the project.*

**Table 2. Training events and number of participants (Source: Supplied by project Team)**

<b>Event</b>	<b>Target Group</b>	<b>No. of Participants</b>	<b>Effect</b>
The Roles of Community Leaders and Natural Resource Management Committees in the Management of Natural Resources	Local Leaders & NR committee Members	20	
Institutional Management & elaboration of Small Projects	NR Committee Members	22	
Electric Fence maintenance: Basic Knowledge of Equipment Functioning	Fence Minders	16	
Electric Fence Maintenance: A Reminder of Basic Training for Mussoma Fence Minders	Fence Minders & NR Committee Members	13	
Exposure visit to Quirimbas National Park: Piri Piri Chilli Applied Fence	Leaders & NR Committee Members of Mussoma Village	7	15 families adhered to the method of chilli fence in Lissongole in Mussoma area
Exposure visit to Quirimbas National Park: Piri Piri Chilli Applied Fence	Leaders & NR Committee members of Negomano Village	6	Negomano fields fenced
Exposure visit to Piri Piri Chilli field Production	Community Members	8	Feedback to other community members in 7 communities attended by about 85 participants; interest in chilli production
Theatre Presentation by OJM Mozambican Youth Organisation	Community Members	10	120 or more attended the show

Overall Assessment: Although no formal training needs assessment was carried out, other means were found to identify training needs, which then focused around human/wildlife conflict and community organisation. Appropriately most training was targeted at the community level, which should also be a strong focus in the next phase. In terms of impact communities are taking responsibility for the erection and maintenance of the electric fence in the Mussamo area, and committees are starting to write small project proposals, although there is no framework for proposals to be received, reviewed or funded. The second phase of the project should give attention to developing such a framework. One option is for projects to be funded by the 20% share of revenue from SRN and (in future) the government. The exposure visits to show people chilli pepper fences and production have been excellent means of extension.

#### Output 2. Community based organisations reviewed, developed and established

SRN began the process of establishing CBOs in the form of Natural Resource Committees and the project has provided ongoing support to these committees. There is one committee covering the two settlements at Naulala, three embryonic committees at Negomano, and five village NR committees fall under an umbrella area committees at Mussamo. This support has included the training referred to under Output 1 as well as facilitation in deciding how to use the income from the 20% revenue sharing distributed by SRN. The project team has also begun the process of assisting the NR committees to become legally registered so that they can receive 20% of the state revenue from licence fees from the safari operators in the hunting blocks in the reserve buffer zone. Training on financial management is planned for the second half of 2005. All committees have been informed of the provisions of legislation covering roles of community leaders in NR management, on fire, land use and wildlife and forestry. A more extensive programme of information on NR legislation is planned using appropriate materials. The project has been directly responsible for the establishment of honey gatherer and fishing groups and associations (see below).

The following is an assessment of whether specific recommendations made by the MTR regarding Output 2 were carried out:

1. Do full RUAT in Mussoma and Negomano and partial in Naulala (more emphasis on mapping and NR options for revenue generation, NR monitoring)

*RUATs for Mussoma and Negomano completed. Naulala delayed because of wet season flooding. NR options – honey gathering/sales, fishing, chilli production – identified. Limited NR monitoring begun as part of honey data gathering and fishing surveys.*

2. Establish piri-piri fencing/production demonstration pilots in at least three focal villages

*Demonstration fencing sites established in two villages, production to start in November with the rains.*

3. Establish and M&E process for this output

*Reporting is being done on effectiveness of the chilli fences, but M&E system for whole output has not been developed.*

The following is an assessment of the extent to which the indicators for Output 2 are being achieved:

- By 2005, at least 3 Resource management committees in each of the 3 villages covering such resources as fisheries, wildlife, beekeeping, timber and non-timber products are created through a participatory process, with responsibilities assigned to each member; these are able to perform up to 80% of the tasks as established in the TOR agreed by the communities

*Two honey gatherer groups have been established at Naulala, 3 small honey groups and one umbrella association have been established at Mussoma, 2 fishing groups and an embryonic association have been formed at Mussoma and the formation of one fishing group and three honey gatherer groups has been discussed at Negomano. These groups have had similar training to the NR committees. As yet no monitoring has been established to measure performance of tasks. However, evidence from reports submitted shows that honey gatherer groups are regularly monitoring production, sales and prices and fishing groups are monitoring catches.*

Overall Assessment: The work of the project team particularly over the past two years has begun to lay an institutional foundation at two levels. One is the level of the Natural Resource Committees. These are representative bodies that are working on behalf of the whole community on issues such as human/wildlife conflict, use of revenue received from SRN and general community development issues. They provide the foundation for the development of future relationships with SRN once these have been defined as part of a reserve policy framework for working with the resident communities. At the second level the project has laid a foundation for groups of resource users to pool their efforts and work cooperatively to improve management of natural resources and to increase income. The next phase of the project should build on these institutional foundations.

Output 3 Participatory land use planning, zonation, and appropriate NRM options examined, selected and developed

The focus of the activities under this Output have shifted away from the original emphasis on land use planning and zonation more towards the identification and development of NRM options. This is mainly because much of the anticipated work on land use planning and zoning depends upon the finalisation of the overall reserve

management plan and the extent to which a new reserve policy framework on community involvement enables local people to carry out land use planning at the local level.

The following is an assessment of whether specific recommendations made by the MTR regarding Output 2 were carried out:

1. Build and follow up on the 2003 scientific surveys and studies – SRN/FFI – e.g. monitoring system for fisheries and catch size/effort

*The project is using the same survey techniques as the survey commissioned by SRN to look at fishing in the reserve. With the help of fishermen and fishing groups, the project is monitoring fishing activities in small streams that are tributaries to the Lugenda River. This activity will be extended to the Lugenda over the next few months. The data being collected is being analysed.*

2. Consolidate and collate community knowledge regarding land use options, zonations, resource status via RUATS (need GPS/GIS and wider mapping improvements)

*The information has been collected through the RUATS. It is planned to develop a GIS map before December 2005.*

3. More knowledge needed on a) sustainability of NR use options (beekeeping, fisheries, NTFPs, timber products) and b) markets for these options.

*Training on sustainable beekeeping methods and marketing studies are planned for the second half of 2005.*

The following is an assessment of the extent to which the indicators for Output 3 are being achieved:

- By 2005, zonation of Niassa Reserve for conservation and NRM proposed by SRN is fully endorsed and supported by all stakeholders

*The management plan and zonation of the reserve are still being finalised by SRN and the government. The meeting on community policy and strategy planned for early September 2005, should help determine the extent to which communities will be able to endorse the results. The RUATs have helped to initiate a preliminary discussion with communities on zoning issues. They have defined community areas for resource use and the areas where settlements might expand to. Honey and fishing surveys are also delivering information on where people use resources. However, the RUATs and resource surveys needed to be done early in the project so that they could feed more strongly into the evolving management plan, which should have been approved in 2004 by government, but is still awaiting finalisation.*

- By 2003, at least 3 community level resource management options (e.g. fishing, beekeeping, tourism) are identified and developed in the 3 selected project sites by members of interest groups and implemented by 2005

*See Output 2. Also, the project has helped with transport of produce to markets and the Mussoma Fishing Association received a net that is appropriate for sustainable fishing. Fishing and honey market studies are planned for second half of 2005 as well as training for the groups on market analysis and identification of additional products.*

Overall Assessment: Useful information has been gathered that can be used to inform the development of the reserve management plan although it is not clear whether the opportunity is still available for this information to feed into the current version of the plan. However, the information should still be useful for management decisions based on the plan and for developing co-management agreements with communities. A start has been made with identifying and developing NR use options that will be supported further by the planned market studies. There is a need to ensure that the information and lessons learned by the project are well documented and made available to SRN.

#### Output 4. Revenue sharing mechanisms developed and implemented

This output was refocused following the recommendations of the MTR (see below). Instead of focusing on revenue sharing agreements, the project team followed the recommendations to concentrate on developing NR options. Activities and results regarding developing NR options have largely been covered under outputs 1-3.

The following is an assessment of whether specific recommendations made by the MTR regarding Output 4 were carried out:

1. Re-focus this output specifically to deal with developing NR options in the villages (beekeeping/fishing/other NR use) via mainly village scale institutions (NR Committees, Associations). Address wider revenue sharing process (20% of state royalties) as requested by SRN and as process/regulations evolve.

*The recommended re-focusing took place. See details under previous outputs. The project team has helped prepare communities for receipt of the 20% and facilitated decisions on how to use the income.*

2. Undertake development process for other NR options (e.g. palm products, piri-piri commercialisation and other timber (?) or non timber forest products)

*See details under outputs 1-3.*

3. Implement fisheries and bee-keeping further in the 3 focal village areas

*See details under outputs 1-3.*

4. Local (and external, if necessary) expertise to analyse sustainability and markets for fisheries, bee-keeping and other NR use options

*Planned for second half of 2005.*

The following is an assessment of the extent to which the indicators for Output 4 are being achieved:

- By 2003, revenue sharing agreements for at least 3 resources (e.g. wildlife, fisheries and timber) are reached through a participatory process involving all stakeholders and are being used as a tool for revenue distribution in the 3 selected project sites

*Due to the re-focusing of this output, this indicator is no longer relevant. However, as noted above in several parts of the text, the project has helped communities deal with issues arising from the distribution of the 20%.*

#### Output 5. Regulations for the use and management of natural resources developed and approval secured

Some early support was given to SRN for drafting of internal regulations for the reserve and discussions were held with communities regarding local rules for fishing and beekeeping. However, much depends upon the scope for local NR management, rule development and institutional evolution allowed by the management plan and the community policy to be developed in September 2005. The project team has therefore adjusted activities to re-focus according to the MTR recommendations and to gain some understanding of existing local rules for resource use.

The following is an assessment of whether specific recommendations made by the MTR regarding Output 5 were carried out:

1. WWF to support dissemination of Land and Forest and Wildlife laws (consultancy costs by skilled disseminators from NGO or Government) with WWF-team to facilitate discussion of these laws/rights in the 3 focal villages.

*Initial work on this has been done (see above) and a more comprehensive programme involving the development and use of appropriate materials is being planned for the second half of 2005.*

2. SRN to re-clarify any support needs on internal regulations/Management Plan process.

*SRN has not requested any specific support on internal regulations. Project experiences and information have been made available formally and informally to*

*feed into the management plan development. There is however, a need to provide documentation that contains more information and deeper analysis than the standard project reporting format allows for.*

3. Focus of institution/rule evolution through local and village practice and applied experimentation.

*The project team has carried out work with fishermen to understand existing local rules regarding fishing and how people organise themselves. A survey is being carried out on how fishing is licensed and permitted by each district with a view to making recommendations for a harmonised system that can be placed under the reserve authorities with the involvement of local fishing resource users groups. However, further work depends upon the management plan and the scope allowed communities to adopt and enforce their own NR rules and institutions.*

The following is an assessment of the extent to which the indicators for Output 5 are being achieved:

- By 2003, regulations for hunting, agriculture, immigration, fishing and the use of timber (fuelwood, charcoal, building) have been developed jointly by CBOs and SRN and adopted by the Board and (if required) submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture for approval

*Due to the re-focusing noted above this indicator is no longer relevant. The strengthening of the NR committees and the resource user groups carried out by the project places them in a position to develop regulations jointly with SRN in future. It was too ambitious to expect that CBOs would be established and in a position to carry out this function by 2003.*

Assessment: The clarification of policy and strategy regarding the role of local communities in co-management of the reserve did not develop far enough for the project to engage in meaningful work with communities regarding the development of local rules for resource use and other issues such as immigration. Further, it has taken time to establish and strengthen local committees that can work with SRN on these issues. However, some useful information has been gathered during RUATs and other surveys which can provide a foundation for future work on local rules. The NR committees and user groups can be used as vehicles to address the joint development of rules and regulations. SRN would like the information being gathered to be compiled and disseminated in a manner that provides more detailed information and analysis than that contained in standard project reports. Although there is an exchange of information at reserve level, SRN would also like information to be available for Maputo HQ as well. In the next phase, the project should give more attention to documenting and disseminating the data being collected and its experiences. SRN should make its information needs known to the project team which should then incorporate this within its work planning.

## Output 6. Collaborative project management functioning

A number of problems regarding project management and the relationship with SRN were highlighted during the MTR. Over the past year relationships have improved considerably, particularly between the new project team leader (who took over in mid 2004) and the reserve warden. There is ongoing informal contact between the two during which issues are raised and problems solved. As a result there has been more integration of project activities with the planning and implementation of reserve objectives. Project team planning and reporting has also improved in line with the recommendations made in the MTR.

The following is an assessment of whether specific recommendations made by the MTR regarding Output 6 were carried out:

1. WWF-team should have one more specific village officer(s) based in Negomano.

*Although this was recommended by the MTR, as a result of subsequent discussions between WWF MCO, SARPO and SRN, it was decided that the time was not right to place a full-time officer at Negomano. As noted elsewhere, the project Team Leader has, however, developed good relationships with the Agriculture Officer at this village who is assisting project implementation in return for fuel and other logistical support from the project.*

2. Urgency to headhunt new team leader (learn lesson from past profile) and recruit third village officer/s (new team leader required on site by the latest at the end of May 2004). Optimal to find ex SPFFB/DNFFB staff, with research and CBNRM experience and knowledge of LFA and if possible RUAT. Able to meet 'new indicator' of acting as temporary substitute Reserve officer in absence of SRN senior staff. Explore the option of employing a team of village level facilitators in Negomano, rather than single mid level staff.

*A new team leader who is a former government forestry and wildlife officer with CBNRM experience was recruited in mid 2004. He has an M.Phil. degree in Development Studies and is a former Provincial head of Forestry and Wildlife. Observations made by the evaluator while working and travelling with the team leader over an 8-day period are that he is dedicated, has good personal and working relationships with the reserve warden, has leadership skills and has a good way of working with local people, including local leaders and government officials.*

3. Need for more field support /practical training from WWF SARPO *in situ* and specific practical training in bee keeping and other NR options.

*No additional training or field support was provided by SARPO in the period since the MTR and this should be addressed in the next phase.*

4. Improve documentation and dissemination of reports and studies. Need by both Team and WWF MCO to have archive of work plans, progress reports, study reports, RUAT reports etc so information is not lost.

*During this evaluation reports and documents appeared to be more readily available than was the case during the MTR. An archive of documents is being developed at Mbatamila. As indicated above, there needs to be better and wider documentation and dissemination of data and lessons learned in order to meet SRN management needs.*

5. Equipment. Need to consider: second bush-mail or a sat-phone for clearer communication links; second motorbike and housing (Negomano), GPS for RUAT work.

*Communications remain a constraint to efficient implementation of the project. Bush-mail is a slow and unpredictable means of communication and the equipment is expensive. The equipment for satellite e-mail transmission is considerably cheaper and much more reliable. It is portable so can be used outside of Mbatamila. For the next phase, the project should re-consider the purchase of satellite e-mail equipment.*

6. SRN and WWF MCO develop process of 3 month, 6 month and 12 month work-plans and progress report system and undertake to meet formally every 6 months for a Technical Committee Meeting.

*The planning and reporting systems for the project have been improved. An indicative annual work plan was developed with SRN and WWF MCO in order to ensure that it meets reserve objectives. The project team reviews the work plan on a monthly basis where possible or at least every two months. Each team member reports on what was done, constraints, and achievements and the team discusses what can be done to make improvements. Regular informal meetings are held with the reserve warden. A 6-monthly meeting of a Technical Committee was instituted and a meeting held in 2004. No meeting has yet been held in 2005. All project progress reports since the MTR have been produced on time and have been distributed to the relevant stakeholders. The report forms attached to the MTR as examples have been adapted and are being used.*

The following is an assessment of the extent to which the indicators for Output 6 are being achieved:

- All narrative and financial reports produced in time and submitted to appropriate offices by Project Partners

*Although this was problematic in the early stages of the project it has been achieved over the past year.*

- Bi-annual reports by Project Executant, Niassa and the Director of the Reserve reflect agreement in at least 90% of the issues from day 1

*The reports are submitted to the Reserve Warden and there is sufficient agreement for effective implementation to take place. It is difficult to determine a specific percentage.*

- Conflicts and contradictions arising in the Project Team in the Reserve are locally resolved without reference to the SRN Board or WWF SARPO

*This has been done effectively over the past year.*

Assessment: Most of the management and relationship problems identified by the MTR have been addressed positively and the indicators for this output are now being met. The SRN director is still concerned however, that the project is not sufficiently integrated with the reserve staffing and implementation structure and views it as a “parallel project”. This is partly because WWF controls the budget and hires its own staff to carry implementation albeit in accordance with reserve objectives. This issue is addressed more fully in sub-sections 8.2 and 8.3 below.

#### 4.2 Overall Assessment of Project Progress

- 1. The project will only achieve a few of its targets by 2005. The main areas in which indicator targets will be met are under Outputs 1 and 2. There are several reasons for this:
  - First, the design of the project had to try to anticipate what activities would be required to support the work of SRN with communities living within the Niassa Reserve. Not all of the envisaged activities proved to be appropriate, because the policy direction followed by the reserve was not aligned with the proposed project activities, or the policy has not evolved sufficiently to provide a framework for these activities. The development of a reserve policy and strategy for working with resident communities in early September 2005 should provide a clear framework within which a second phase of the project can operate. The lack of a clear framework during the first phase meant that the project needed to respond to changing circumstances and work within an experimental and evolving approach to community work that was adopted by SRN. The project was also trying to determine methods and approaches that could work in the Niassa context.
  - Another factor contributing to slow progress was the delay in recruiting staff, and what the MTR has referred to as a period of “crisis” in the early stages of implementation. However, the project began to gain direction from late 2003 to early 2004 and since mid 2004, with the appointment of a new team leader, has begun to achieve some more concrete results.

- There is a strong perception by the WWF MCO that some field activities in the early part of 2005 could not be carried out because of funding constraints. (This issue is dealt with in more detail on page 40)
  - In addition, the destruction of a bridge by a flash flood caused the project team to be cut off from two of its focal villages for several months in the first half of 2005.
- Despite the constraints noted above, the project has begun to have positive impacts (although not necessarily in terms of the original project activities and indicators):
- There is consensus between the project team and SRN that project activities with resident communities have helped to improve relationships between local people and the reserve and its management staff. In the past, there was considerable hostility towards the reserve and its staff. Now people are more positive. For example during the evaluation at Mussoma, villagers requested more scouts to be stationed there to assist people with problem animals. The project, working with the reserve staff on problem animal issues, has helped to demonstrate that the reserve cares about the people living there and not just about the conservation of wild animals.
  - There is also agreement among stakeholders that people are much more willing to participate and make an effort for their own benefit than in the past instead of just waiting for hand outs. For example at Mussoma the committee is taking the leadership for fence maintenance and has used the income shared by SRN wisely (e.g. to pay fence minders, and to fund a local entrepreneur to start a village shop).
  - The project has exposed villagers to new ideas such as the chilli fencing and new income generation options. This has generated hope that standards of living can be improved despite the problems and restrictions that are experienced because people live in the reserve.
  - Information, lessons and experiences from project implementation is available to help shape SRN and decisions. For example the project team says information from communities has influenced SRN to recognise the importance of honey and fishing for local livelihoods. Experiences of working with communities on electric fences helps all stakeholders to better understand how the fences can best be implemented and the experience at Mussoma provides an example of an electric fence can be successful once a community starts to take ownership over the fence and its maintenance. The work on chilli pepper fences is starting to show how alternative approaches can also work, and the survey work on fishing is starting to generate useful information about where and how people catch fish and the quantities and species caught in areas not covered by the previous survey. However, this information and these

experiences need to be documented in some detail and more widely disseminated.

- Honey Gatherer and Fishing Resource user groups have been established that are currently yielding useful information about the use of these resources, and also provide a good foundation for organising group management of these resources, and an increase in benefits to organised users.
- Although some stakeholders have questioned the value of the NR committees, and the MTR referred to them as a “temporary scaffold” these committees can potentially play several important roles. Much depends however on the policy and strategy for working with communities that emerges in early September 2005. Currently the committees are meeting to discuss and implement problem animal management measures. This might explain why they are more functional than at the time of the MTR. If the new policy and strategy envisage a significant level of community involvement in NR management and in the affairs of the reserve, then these NR committees will be invaluable for channelling communications between communities and SRN. They further provide appropriate level institutions to deal with issues that are broader than the interests of the resource user groups which focus on specific issues that directly affect a smaller group of people. The NR committees, incorporating traditional leaders and leaders appointed through government and political parties, can emerge as representative bodies that can lead development and address cross-cutting NR issues in a community. Such a more broad-based community organisation is required for example to ensure that the use of the income distributed by SRN is according to community priorities and is equitable, and to provide some level of accountability for the use of the funds and proper financial management. Once such committees are legalised, this provides opportunities for communities to enter into contracts with SRN and other private sector instances, if for example, community tourism concessions are contemplated. These committees also provide a platform for women to be involved in leadership positions and for the voices of women to be heard. Currently the NR committees are the only formal channel women have to influence decisions. Committees should not necessarily be used to try to run community businesses however, as this rarely works well.

## 5. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

The Project Document envisaged that implementation would be carried out by a WWF CBNRM team that would be headed by a “project Executant-cum-CBNRM Specialist” assisted by three Resource Management Facilitators and an Administrative Assistant. This team would work under the Reserve Warden whose staff would combine with the WWF team to implement CBNRM activities “in conjunction and as a single, unified body delivering services to the communities” (WWF 2000). Both the WWF Project Executant and the Reserve Warden would jointly report on Project activities to the SRN Board and WWF.

This approach did not develop at the start of the project, and the consequences of this are still being felt. The MTR notes that “the lack of a clear work-plan that was focused on achieving specified outputs of the project and of an adequate reporting process was compounded by the relatively inexperienced team/Team Leader of the project and the limited field support by WWF MCO or WWF SARPO to them. These factors led to the project ‘drifting’ in focus, the rise of professional and personal conflicts between the Team Leader and SRN-N staff which in turn led to it being effectively sidelined or referred to as a ‘parallel’ project by SRN (or other observers) that was not integrated within the reserve management process” (Anstey *et al* 2004).

It is unfortunate that this situation arose, as the implementation approach envisaged by the Project Document was a sound one. It did however depend upon the right individuals to make it work. To a large extent, the approach currently being adopted in practice is that of the Project Document. Joint planning is taking place with the SRN warden, the warden has inputs into WWF team reports, there is a sharing of resources, the WWF team provides considerable support to the SRN community officer and implementation is better aligned with reserve needs. Although the appointment of a new Team Leader has done much to improve project management in the reserve and to build a working relationship with the reserve warden, institutionally the scars of this early experience remain. The SRN Director still talks of a parallel project and expresses concern that a continuation of the existing implementation strategy into another phase would not provide sufficient integration (this issue is addressed in more detail in sub-section 8.3.).

The original plan for the deployment of human resources envisaged for the Project Team was not implemented. The team consists of a Team Leader and two community officers, not the three that were planned for. All three are based at Mbatamila rather than having officers based in the focal villages, however, each is responsible for one of the focal villages. There is no separate administrative officer. Certainly a third community officer would have helped implementation, but there does not seem to be any need for a separate administrative officer. There are pros and cons to having the team altogether at Mbatamila. This facilitates planning and working together as a team, but means that visits to the focal villages can be infrequent particularly during the wet season. On the other hand, team members would be cut off from each other in the wet season for the same reasons. The project has started to adopt the approach of appointing village facilitators

(one has so far been appointed at Mussoma). This would seem to be the best way to work in the circumstances and such village facilitators should be appointed in the other two focal villages particularly for the next phase.

The project found it difficult to appoint experienced personnel with the right sort of skills and expertise to implement a CBNRM project. The current team leader has this background, but the two community officers have been learning on the job. It should be recognised, however, that community conservation work such as that planned for the Niassa Reserve, requires a broad spectrum of expertise including community mobilisation and organisation, governance and accountability, business development, and natural resource management. It is very rare to find one person who possesses all of these skills and it is not easy even to put together a team that combines these skills. In such circumstances it is useful to build the general skills of key staff so that they have an understanding of what is required and can coordinate the inputs of other specialists who are brought in on a short-term basis. It is recommended that such an approach be built in to the implementation of the next phase.

Due to the constraints on telecommunications within the reserve, communications between the Project Team and the WWF MCO are patchy and could be improved with better technology. In general the communications between the MCO and the SRN Director are good, although this is based as much on good personal relationships as on good institutional relationships. Although measures can be taken to improve institutional relationships, such as clear definitions of roles and responsibilities, lines of accountability and reporting, MOUs etc., to a large extent working relationships in such small communities as Mbatamila, or within conservation in Mozambique, will always depend upon good personal relationships. It is recommended, however, that for the next phase, the MOU between WWF and SRN is strengthened and that there is further definition of roles, responsibilities and accountability (see sub-section 8.3).

In general the communications between WWF MCO and WWF Norway appear to be good, and do not negatively affect project implementation. There were problems in the early stages of the project with funding flows, but these problems were addressed. However, WWF MCO has a strong perception that the disbursement system followed by NORAD with tranches of funds arriving at intervals during the year places a strain on field implementation particularly early in the year. In 2005 WWF Norway sent about 32% of the funding for the year on 31<sup>st</sup> January and this was received by WWF MCO on 14<sup>th</sup> February. A further 30% was sent on 27<sup>th</sup> May and arrived on 13<sup>th</sup> June. According to WWF MCO some field activities could not be implemented early in the year because of a lack of funding. WWF Norway itself has cash flow constraints which leave it with limited possibilities for compensating for the NORAD disbursement cycle. Given that salaries take up more than a third of project expenditure (based on the figures in the Project Document), this means that of the 32% of the total annual budget received at the start of the year, a large portion of this is spent on salaries over the following 5 months and comparatively little is left for implementation.

The funding “pipeline” is also a long one. Once the tap has been turned on by NORAD, the flow is via WWF Norway, through SARPO to the MCO, and then from the MCO to a team bank account. Administrative delays are possible anywhere along this pipeline and have occurred in the past. The frustrations for the Project Team are compounded by the fact that the team bank account is held in a town that is a day’s drive away and there is no good communication with the bank. Although there did not seem to be a pipeline blockage during the first half of 2005, the priority should clearly be to get the funding to the field as quickly and efficiently as possible.

It is recommended that WWF Norway, WWF SARPO and WWF MCO revisit this issue to see if ways can be found to mitigate the effects of the NORAD system for disbursing funds. WWF Norway has for example, when cash flow permitted, advanced its match funds early in the year on special request. There is also perhaps scope for WWF SARPO to show some flexibility in shifting funds and careful scheduling of activities needs to be done by WWF MCO.

## 6. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) has been one of the weakest aspects of the SRN-WWF CBNRM project. The MTR noted that the indicators for the Development Objective of the project emphasise households, cash incomes and comparative status of ‘selected’ wildlife species and habitat around the focal villages. However, very little or no baseline data had been collected or extracted from available sources so that change over time in achieving indicator targets could be measured. The MTR found that (Anstey *et al* 2003: 10):

- “There is currently very little baseline data collated on the habitat status around the 3 villages. This will make it difficult to validate these project indicators in 2005.
- No wildlife species appear to have been ‘selected’, nor baseline data collated at start of project which also makes this other indicator hard to validate. For example, the villagers in Mussoma noted that the increase in elephant numbers in their area was (they perhaps pointedly alleged) resulting in a decline in palm species and fruit bearing trees – thus highlighting the need to clarify - what are the selected species to monitor and what habitat vs species criteria to assess?
- The emphasis on household scale needs data collated at this scale. Currently only Naulala of the 3 villages has such data”.

Further, the MTR recommended that specific M&E processes should be established for outputs 1 and 2.

Assessment: Since the MTR little has been done to implement these recommendations. The project still has no systematic approach to M&E. Although some baseline data has been collected at village level in the RUATs, it has not been extracted and used as part of a monitoring process to demonstrate change and impact. Neither has data available from

SRN surveys of the reserve been extracted for monitoring purposes. Part of the reason for the project not developing an M&E system appears to be the lack of attention to the project document highlighted by the MTR. This situation has improved in terms of giving more attention to planning according to the Outputs and Activities contained in the project document, but not in terms of focusing on the indicators and targets. The project team needed to have conducted regular reviews of the logical framework in order to assess the original indicators and targets, revise them where necessary (with appropriate justification) and make them more realistic where necessary. M&E is a critical issue to be addressed in the next phase of the project, particularly the establishment of a baseline from which progress can be measured.

## 7. LESSONS LEARNED

A number of lessons have emerged from the project implementation experience.

- a) Implementation of community conservation requires a broad range of skills that may not be possible to acquire even within a team. As part of an implementation strategy strategic partnerships should be developed with organisations that have specialist skills or individuals should be used to provide short-term inputs with ongoing follow-up being provided by the team on the ground.
- b) It is very important to be able to make frequent visits to focal communities to ensure continued progress. The best progress has been made by Mussoma, which is closest to the project team's base at Mbatamila and the most accessible in the wet season. The approach of placing community facilitators in each focal village should be expanded to ensure a permanent project presence and ongoing follow-up.
- c) Different approaches to community development by different stakeholders can cause problems for the project in implementation because communities have different expectations. It is important to try to develop common approaches, particularly between the Project Team, SRN and government officials operating inside the reserve.
- d) It is important to support activities that directly benefit communities such as reducing damage to crops by elephants and other wildlife, and increasing incomes from Natural Resource-based activities. This support can provide immediate benefits and demonstrate that the reserve authorities do care about people as well as wildlife. It also helps to motivate communities and enables them to participate more in other project activities.
- e) Income generation needs to be approached as a business not as a community project. Market studies need to be carried out and the viability of the activity investigated.

- f) There needs to be more focus on specific priority activities for project implementation to give staff a clear direction for what they should initially concentrate on. Some activities depend upon others to lay an initial foundation so the project design should be clear on the sequencing of activities.
- g) The training for staff and communities needs to be context specific i.e. with more focus on the problems and issues that arise from communities living inside a protected area rather than on CBNRM which focuses on community rights over land and resources outside of PAs.
- h) Exposure visits for community leaders and members to other communities or projects to demonstrate the value of a particular technology or approach are extremely valuable. There is a high level of up-take of the new approach (e.g. chilli fences to deter elephants) and these visits subsequently generate a high degree of interest and participation even among those who did not go on the visit.

## 8. RECOMMENDATIONS

### 8.1 Recommendation for Project Continuation

A key question in the evaluation was to assess whether the Project should continue or not. The evaluator finds that the Project has laid a sufficient foundation to move into a second phase despite the problems documented in this report regarding implementation. It is therefore recommended that the Project should continue. This finding and this recommendation are based on a number of criteria that were used for analysis. These criteria considered below:

*Are there major problems or failures that undermine potential success?*

Although the project made a slow start, and experienced problems in implementation and management, these problems have not been sufficient to constitute failures that would undermine potential success. Particularly as a result of the MTR, the problems were identified, and addressed. Adjustments were made to implementation approaches and to management and reporting that have enabled some concrete results to be achieved.

*Is the Project still relevant?*

The project remains very relevant in the sense that there is still a major need for support to community involvement in the management of Niassa Reserve through the emergence of co-management arrangements with the reserve authorities. Some of the activities originally envisaged for the project proved not to be so relevant because a co-management framework is still evolving which so far has not been aligned with aspects of the original project design. However, the project has adopted its implementation approach to meet these circumstances and to ensure that its activities have been more relevant to the needs on the ground. In effect, the project has re-shaped itself from a

CBNRM project inside a protected area more towards a set of experimental activities that are helping to inform the evolution of a co-management approach within the protected area. The development of a reserve policy and strategy on co-management should enable the design of a second phase to ensure a close fit with clearly defined reserve objectives.

*Were the activities planned for the First Phase carried out and do they provide a foundation for continuation?*

As noted throughout this report not all the activities planned were relevant and so some were not carried out at all, and others not in the way originally envisaged. However, the work that has been carried out and the results achieved *do* provide a foundation for a second phase. Communities have begun to organise under the NR committees and the resource user groups and are dealing with problem animal issues. A start has been made with establishing the means to increase incomes. This work needs to be consolidated and continued to make the development investment so far provide some dividends.

*Have the risks and enabling environment changed to adversely affect prospects of success?*

Although assumptions regarding income from safari hunting and the development of eco-tourism were incorrect, the overall enabling environment for the project remains positive. In particular government policy concerning community involvement in NRM is continuing to evolve in a positive direction and during 2005 the decree enabling the state to share 20% of revenue from NRM was finally approved and issued.

As a result, continuation of the project and the design of a second phase are recommended. However, particular attention needs to be given to the following in the design process and in project implementation:

- SRN concerns about a “parallel” project need to be addressed so that a second phase is clearly integrated with SRN reserve management activities and objectives.
- The overall project approach should be framed as supporting co-management arrangements between SRN and local communities rather than as a “CBNRM” project.
- The Outputs and Indicators should be re-framed and re-organised to more realistically reflect the current situation within the reserve, and to reflect activities appropriate to promoting co-management.
- Once new targets and indicators have been agreed upon, a baseline for each should be identified, and if necessary, the appropriate baseline data should be collected. A much more rigorous approach to monitoring and evaluation needs to be taken in the next phase.
- The Project Team should view the logical framework as a living document that needs to be revised if necessary. If such revisions are made, these should be recorded in a revised logical framework, which is disseminated to relevant

stakeholders and which should then become the new framework within which the project is implemented and evaluated against.

## 8.2 Context for Developing a Second Phase

### *SRN plans for the future*

The current management lease for the reserve ends in 2012 and SRN is negotiating with government for an extension for a further 25 year period. This would provide sufficient longer-term security to SRN to invest in developing the reserve so that it can generate more income. Currently income is being absorbed by management costs and the reserve depends upon donor contributions. The private investors in SRN have agreed not to take any dividends or profits at this stage as it is clear that it will take some years before the reserve income can cover its management costs. Ideally SRN would like to set up a foundation or trust that can receive donations for specific management aspects such as ongoing research. The likelihood of SRN negotiating a continued contract is good according to Deputy Director for Conservation in the Ministry of Tourism, Ms Isabel Macie. She said the Ministry was happy with the relationship with SRN and wanted it to continue. The Ministry was pleased with this approach to protected area management and was considering expanding it to other areas. It is not so clear, however whether there is the same level of support for the approach at a political level.

SRN's main strategic partner for reserve management is the UK-based conservation NGO, Fauna and Flora International (FFI), which has assisted SRN by raising funds and providing technical assistance. Other donors have included US Fish and Wildlife, USAID, and the Tusk Foundation. SRN's vision is that it will identify an overall programme of action and that organisations such as WWF and FFI and major donors would be able to fund and support specific parts of the programme that fall under their own areas of interest. Thus SRN would be happy for WWF to continue to fund all or part of a community component of the reserve's overall action plan. However, SRN would like to receive the funds, determine how they are spent and hire the staff to implement a community programme. This is viewed as best way to ensure that SRN objectives can be fully met, that funds can be flexibly used to meet reserve needs, and that the capacity of reserve staff to work with communities is built (A. Rodrigues, *pers. comm.*).

With regard to future community work, the reserve approach will be further developed during the meeting to be held in early September with support from FFI. WWF and other stakeholders will be part of this meeting. In order to facilitate the development of the WWF second phase, SRN shared some of the ideas that it would be taking into the September meeting for discussion. SRN recognises that people will always live in the park but wishes to promote development in the buffer zone and on the reserve periphery so that more people will not be attracted to the core area and hopefully some of the people living there would be attracted away to other development nodes. One idea is to encourage government to view the two districts that fall within the reserve to be viewed as "eco-districts" so that development policies and implementation can be more

environmentally friendly. The reserve has been zoned into management units based on river catchments. Specific plans will be developed for each unit. The circumstances regarding local communities would be different in each district and co-management approaches would need to be tailored to these different circumstances. In some cases for example people are living in isolated villages in the core area with few other development opportunities. These people could be incorporated into park management as scouts and wildlife monitors. In buffer zone areas opportunities could be explored for closer relationships between communities and the safari operator. SRN would like to negotiate resource use areas and areas that should be free from use with the communities. SRN would like to see further community work focus on income generation activities such as honey gathering and fishing, further strengthening of community committees and support to communities on the use of the 20% revenue sharing from the reserve, and in future from the state.

Although FFI has a specific interest in community aspects of reserve management, the organisation is not aiming to develop its own community programmes. When asked specifically if FFI thought there was space for further WWF involvement in community work in the reserve, Matthew Rice of FFI made the following points:

- a) FFI favoured working with partners in a joint effort to support a conservation programme
- b) WWF has technical expertise that FFI does not have
- c) FFI would be unlikely to raise all the funds required for a community component
- d) WWF would probably have more of a role than FFI on community work

#### *Other existing or planned activities in an around the Niassa Reserve*

A number of other NRM and development activities are being carried out or planned that affect the reserve. A CBNRM project based on sharing hunting revenue with local communities called Chipanje Chetu has been operating for some years on the reserve's north-western boundary. This project is a modified version of the Tchuma Tchato CBNRM project that was developed in Tete Province in the 1990s. Although there appear to be some problems with the safari operator in Chipanje Chetu, there is the opportunity to develop links between this project and future community-based activities in the reserve for the sharing of experiences and lessons learned.

FFI, with the South African-based branch of Resource Africa is providing support to the Niassa Provincial Government (including the Forestry and Wildlife authority - SPFFB) aimed at complementing the organisation's support to the reserve. A two-year grant from the US Government is being used to generate information on the various conservation activities and programmes in the province, carry out a rapid natural resource assessment, update maps of the province, assess institutional arrangements for conservation in the province and carry out a needs assessment. So far provincial priorities appear to be focused on developing a provincial land use plan, developing tender processes for

contracts with the private sector, dealing with human/wildlife conflict, and making a success of Chipanje Chetu.

A number of development NGOs are operating in Niassa Province. Some of these focus on community mobilisation and organisational development, including the legalisation of community committees. The project team is already working with some of these NGOs in order to obtain assistance for supporting the NR committees and getting them legalised. Other NGOs focus on agricultural development and micro finance, including a Swedish project supporting small and medium enterprise development. An organisation that could potentially provide support to future community-based activities in the reserve is the Cooperative League of the USA (CLUSA). This organisation is working on developing agricultural markets and credit schemes. Elsewhere in Africa, including Zambia and Namibia, CLUSA is working on an approach called 'conservation farming' which aims to remove the need for shifting agriculture by improving inputs and yields on the same piece of land. Conservation farming would be a useful approach in the reserve to help reduce the clearing of forest for the development of new crop fields.

Extractive, or potentially extractive activities around the reserve include logging on the western boundary and ongoing mining exploration. The logging activities could potentially attract labour from within the reserve. Prospectors were illegally in the buffer zone north east of Mussamo while the evaluation was taking place. SRN is working with provincial and national level government officials and politicians to try to prevent illegal prospecting and to ensure that the integrity and legitimacy of the reserve are recognised by other government departments. This includes trying to ensure that district and provincial development plans fully recognise the authority of SRN and do not ignore the conservation status of the reserve. SRN is also discussing the implications of a tobacco production scheme with the tobacco company involved.

A number of new infrastructure developments are being planned. Some such as an improved road to Marrupa, just over 100 km from the reserve entrance, will help to improve transport and communications, which can assist future tourism development. Plans to develop facilities and services such as a hospital at Marrupa could attract people from the reserve, and an extension of the power lines from Cahora Bassa will also help to bring further development around the reserve. However, the construction of a planned bridge over the Rovuma River linking Tanzania and the reserve by road would appear to have more negative than positive impacts. This road link would not serve to increase tourism but would rather increase local trade through the park which already has a number of negative impacts including regular and probably too frequent setting of fires, which burn across large areas of the reserve.

### 8.3 Recommendations for Designing a Second Phase

Based on the findings of this evaluation, the following are recommendations for a second phase of the project:

#### a) Institutional Relationships

The design of the next phase should take into account the concerns raised by SRN regarding the dangers of a parallel project that is not sufficiently integrated with reserve management objectives and activities. The next phase should also be careful not to create a situation of a well-funded external project with plenty of vehicles and equipment compared to a struggling reserve management staff who are under funded and under resourced. There is also a need to place much more emphasis on building the capacity of SRN to carry out community engagement work itself and not to be dependent always on external assistance. However, there are some strong reasons why WWF should not at this stage consider simply handing over funding for SRN to implement its own community engagement project:

- Currently SRN does not have the management capacity in terms of managers with skills and experience in community work to run its own community engagement activities. There is one reserve warden who is fully engaged with the day-to-day management activities of the reserve, with no deputy or middle management staff to assist him. SRN has one community officer who lacks experience and expertise and is largely dependent upon the project team for transport and direction in his work.
- There is a danger that if financial resources and equipment for community work were to be transferred directly to SRN, they would be diverted to other management activities deemed at the time to be more urgent. This situation has already arisen with regard to project co-funding of the SRN community officer. WWF MCO stopped this funding support when it became clear that the officer was being used for other management activities that drew him away from community work.
- Both the SRN reserve warden and the project team leader have emphasised the value of having separate staff to carry out community engagement work to those that carry out law enforcement. At this stage of the developing relationship between reserve management and the communities, it is useful to have an outside organisation that is working under the SRN mandate, but slightly separate from it to help broker the development of trust and to help negotiate co-management arrangements and agreements. To use a sporting analogy, it is not useful for developing trust at this stage if SRN is the referee as well as a player.
- From WWF's perspective, its direct role in supporting community engagement in the Niassa Reserve, is providing valuable lessons and comparisons with its other activities that involve working with communities in protected areas such as the Quirimbas National Park and

the Bazaruto Marine Reserve. Further WWF has access to a network of regional experts with experience in CBNRM and community involvement in protected area management that it can draw upon to assist the activities in Niassa Reserve.

For these reasons, what is proposed for the next phase of the project is a transitional phase in which WWF continues to provide implementation for a defined period of time during which it will build the capacity of SRN to carry out community engagement work with a target date for handing over full responsibility to SRN. It should be made very clear that the project will support the objectives of the reserve and work according to reserve policies and strategies for engaging with resident communities. The project should fund two additional community officers at Diploma level who would be SRN hired staff, working directly for SRN. These two officers would work with the current WWF staff as one team operating under the mandate of SRN and the direction of the current team leader to achieve reserve objectives. This team would report directly to the SRN reserve warden. The warden would involve the team leader fully in all planning of park management activities, and as was requested under the current phase of the project, the community team leader would act as a stand in for the warden when necessary. Once the transitional stage has been completed, SRN would have the option of retaining members of the project team under its own funding, raised from other sources or perhaps also through WWF.

The next phase of the project should incorporate specific capacity building activities for the new SRN staff that includes short courses on community development, community involvement in protected areas, etc. as well as exposure visits to other community conservation projects in the region. While the Niassa Reserve needs to develop its own policies and approaches to deal with its specific circumstances, there is much to be learnt from the methodologies and approaches of other community conservation projects. There should be a specific Output in the next phase that addresses the establishment and capacity building of an SRN community conservation team.

In addition the project should fund or co-fund an additional position in SRN – that of a qualified mechanic. The efficiency of reserve management and of the community conservation activities will be considerably increased by having a qualified mechanic on site who can service and repair vehicles and other mechanical equipment.

## b) Project Focus

In view of the findings of the evaluation and in line with the plans for future community conservation in the reserve outlined by SRN, the following should be the main areas of focus:

- ✓ Institutional support to community NR resource committees and resource user groups. This would include strengthening the representativeness and

accountability of the NR committees; legalisation of committees in order to receive the 20% state revenue share; organisational strengthening of NR committees and user groups; financial management training; support for negotiating co-management agreements with SRN and potentially the private sector; support for deciding how to use income from revenue sharing and for accounting for this revenue. HIV/AIDS and the involvement of women have received little attention in the first phase. These aspects should be addressed as part of the overall component of institutional support to communities. The project should try to partner with an organisation that specialises in HIV/AIDS issues rather than trying to implement activities itself.

- ✓ As mentioned above – capacity building to the Reserve community conservation team, particularly the proposed new SRN staff, including short courses, exposure visits and access to relevant literature.
- ✓ Support to income generation activities such as honey gathering, fishing and chilli production, including developing links to markets, micro-financing, and the identification of other income generation activities. If tourism starts to develop within the reserve and park policies allow for community concessions for campsites and/or lodges, then the project would provide support to communities in this area.
- ✓ Support to sustainable management of land and natural resources by local communities: this would include sustainable harvesting of honey and fish and any other resources for commercial use; addressing human/wildlife conflict; development of local resource use and regulations in conjunction with the reserve authorities; promotion of conservation farming; local land use planning; fire management; and, if emerging reserve policies allow, wildlife quota setting for own use and wildlife monitoring;

It is suggested that each of the above be packaged as a project Output, under the existing Development Objective and Purpose. In order to provide focus given the large area of the reserve and the number of communities, there needs to be some prioritisation of these activities and of geographic target areas. It is recommended that geographically the three focal villages of the current project should be retained. The investment so far in these villages has laid a foundation that should bear good results in the next phase. Not to continue with these villages (including Negomano) would lead to a dashing of expectations and hope that would be extremely negative for the reserve and the project. Initial priority areas would be institutional support to the committees and resource user groups (because these committees and groups provide the vehicle and mechanism for carrying out many other activities); income generation and continued work on human wildlife conflict (because these are both activities that positively affect livelihoods). In reality there should also be sequencing of the activities. For example, market studies, business feasibility plans and investigation of the availability of micro-credit should be carried out before income generation activities are embarked upon. Communities need to be fairly well organised and there need to be representative bodies in place before co-management agreements can be negotiated.

### c) Implementation approach

As noted above, a single combined SRN and WWF community conservation team should implement the activities. A training schedule should be developed to ensure that this team has the right skills to address priority issues. However, as noted in Section 5 above, it is unrealistic to expect the team to have all the skills and expertise to carry out the multi-disciplinary tasks required to implement community conservation. As far as possible the team should develop partnerships with other organisations working in the province such as CLUSA and NGOs working on community organisation and legalisation. The project should include a budget line that can pay for the services of these organisations as they generally have their own focal geographic areas where they work and will need to be enticed to work in the reserve. The project should also make use of individuals with specific skills and expertise that can provide short-term specialised inputs, with the project team providing ongoing follow-up.

All planning of community conservation activities should be fully integrated with reserve plans and should be done jointly with the reserve warden and his staff. Funding could be split with perhaps 50% or more going directly to SRN including all salaries while WWF retains some funding for training and capacity building activities and events. WWF should make a strong effort to access expertise available through its own networks and to arrange exposure visits for the community conservation team staff through these networks (including internationally where there are examples of co-management between conservation authorities and people resident in protected areas).

WWF should also explore the development of a closer partnership with FFI with regard to fund raising and coordination of inputs regarding community conservation and technical advice provided to SRN. If FFI continue to provide advice and support through regular visits to the reserve, then the WWF team leader should be regarded as a more day-to-day technical advisor to SRN management in the reserve on community conservation issues. The current Technical Committee should also include FFI in order to ensure good coordination and avoid duplication or a misunderstanding of roles.

The existing MOU with SRN should be expanded to include these implementation arrangements and to include a target date for the transfer of all community conservation activities to SRN. It might be useful to include FFI in a tripartite MOU that clearly spells out all the roles and responsibilities of each party.

## LIST OF REFERENCES AND DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

Anstey, S., Taylor, R., Motta, M., and A. Martinussen. 2004. Mid-term Internal Progress Review: Niassa Reserve Community (CBNRM) Project. WWF Mozambique Country Office. Maputo.

Booth, V. R. 2002. An Analysis of Safari Hunting Operations in Niassa Reserve Buffer Zones. SRN. Maputo.

Chande, B. 2005. Nature conservation in Niassa is a bit fishy. Draft article.

Craig, G. C. and D. St C Gibson. 2004. Aerial Survey of Wildlife in the Niassa Reserve and Surrounds, Mozambique. SRN. Maputo.

Craig, G. C. and D. St Clair Gibson. 2002. Aerial Survey of Wildlife in the Niassa Reserve and Hunting Concessions, Mozambique. Fauna and Flora International. Cambridge.

Cunliffe, R., Serra, A., Manuel, J., Nandja, B., and N. Rigava. 2005. An Assessment of the the Negomano Community, Niassa Reserve: October 2004. Consultant Report Prepared for Sociedade para a Gestão e Desenvolvimento da Reserva do Niassa Moçambique. SRN. Maputo.

Government of Mozambique. 1999. Forest and Wildlife Act (No. 10 of 1999). English translation.

Osborn. F. V. and S. Anstey. 2002. Elephant/human conflict and community development around the Niassa Reserve, Mozambique. WWF-SARPO. Harare.

SRN. 2003. A Planning Framework for the Management of the Niassa Reserve: 2003-2008. SRN. Maputo.

SRN. 2003. Niassa Reserve Action Plan: 2003. SRN. Maputo.

West, P. C. and S. R. Brechin (eds). 1991. Resident Peoples and National Parks: Social Dilemmas and Strategies in International Conservation. University of Arizona Press. Tucson.

Wiinblad, M. 2003. Community Conservation in the Niassa Reserve in Mozambique. Thesis. University of Copenhagen, Centre for African Studies. Copenhagen.

WWF. 2005. Niassa CBNRM Project: Technical Progress Report: January to June 2005. WWF Mozambique Country Office. Maputo.

WWF. 2004. Niassa Reserve Natural Resource Management, Mozambique: Annual Report 2004. WWF-Norway, WWF SARPO. Oslo.

WWF. 2000. Community-based Natural Resources Project (CBNRM) Niassa Reserve Mozambique: Project Document. SRN-WWF SARPO. Harare.

WWF Niassa Project Team. 2005. Indicative Workplan. WWF Mozambique Country Office. Maputo.

WWF-Norway. 2003. Community-based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) in Niassa Reserve, Mozambique: Annual Project Report for 2002. WWF Norway. Oslo.

WWF-Norway. 2002. Project proposal: CBNRM Niassa Reserve. WWF Norway. Oslo.

## ANNEX 1 LIST OF PERSONS CONSULTED

Baldeu Chande	Senior Game Warden, Niassa Reserve
Joao Manuel	Community Officer, WWF Niassa Project Team
Isabel M. Macie	Deputy Director for Conservation, Directorate of Conservation Areas, Ministry of Tourism
Mecula District Administrator	
Helena Motta	Head of WWF MCO
Albino C. Batista Nandja	Community Officer, WWF Niassa Project Team
Assane Ambrosio A. Nkukuta	Agricultural Officer, Negomano
Matthew Rice	Technical Advisor, FFI
Joao Baptista Paula	Mecula District Agricultural Director
Anabela Rodrigues	Director, SRN
Antonio Serra	Leader, WWF Niassa Project Team
Russell Taylor	Conservation Director, WWF SARPO
Americo Vaba	District Government officer, Negomano

### Meeting at Mussoma Village, 21.07.05

32 community members (2 female), 1 Reserve Scout, a District Government representative, 4 members of the WWF Project Team (including a village facilitator).

The community members consisted of traditional leaders, members of the Mussoma area Natural Resource Committee, members of village Natural Resource Committees, members of the Mussoma area Fishing Association, members of village fishing groups, members of village honey gatherer groups, electric fence minders, the Secretary of the Mussoma Village Frelimo Party organisation, and villagers.

### Meeting at Naulala Village, 22.07.05

16 male community members, 1 Reserve Community Officer, 1 Reserve Scout, 3 members of the WWF Project Team.

The community members consisted of the traditional leader of one of the villages comprising Naulala, members of the Natural Resource Committee, members of the village honey gathering group, and an electric fence minder.

### Meeting at Negomano Village, 26.07.05

8 community members (1 female), a District Agriculture Officer, 1 member of the WWF Project Team.

The community members consisted of traditional leaders, members of the Natural Resource Committees of two villages, a honey gatherer and a villager.

ANNEX 2  
ORIGINAL LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	EXTERNAL FACTORS/ ASSUMPTIONS
<p><b>Development Objective (Goal):</b> Local communities benefit from and maintain habitats and numbers of selected wildlife species in Niassa Reserve and the Buffer Zones in Mozambique</p>	<p><b>Selected Indicators:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- By 2005, at least 1030 HH living in Naulala, Mussoma, and Negomano receive cash benefits of USD 10/HH/Year or more from wildlife and NRM activities</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONTINUED ON PAGE 3</b></p>	<p><b>To achieve Dev. Objective (Goal):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Effect of extreme climatic conditions like drought and flood remain marginal</li> <li>- Wildlife and NRM remains an economically viable option in the 3 project sites</li> <li>- A supportive policy and legal framework for biodiversity conservation and CBNRM continues</li> <li>- Political and macro-economic stability is maintained</li> </ul>
<p><b>Immediate Objective (Purpose):</b> Community-based organisations are actively managing natural resources in conjunction with the management authority in Niassa Reserve and the Buffer Zones</p>	<p><b>Selected Indicators:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- By 2002, at least 1 community leader representing the 3 project sites participates in SRN Board Meetings</li> <li>- By 2005, at least 1 CBO from each of the 3 selected project sites regularly carry out consultations at community level on NRM activities and, in coordination with the management authority conduct planning exercises, oversee implementation and participate in M&amp;E</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONTINUED ON PAGE 3</b></p>	<p><b>To achieve I. Objective (Purpose):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Favourable policy and legislative framework to support CBNRM continues to exist</li> <li>- Communities are willing to participate actively in managing natural resources</li> <li>- Wildlife resources and other natural resources are sufficient to provide adequate incentives for community participation in CBNRM</li> <li>- Sufficient revenue earned by SFDRN and available for distribution and sharing</li> </ul>
<p><b>Project Outputs:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NRM knowledge and skills of CBO leaders, resource managers and others at Provincial and District levels improved</li> <li>2. Community-based organisations reviewed, developed and established</li> <li>3. Participatory land use planning, zonation and appropriate NRM options examined, selected and developed</li> <li>4. Revenue sharing mechanisms developed and implemented</li> <li>5. Regulations for the use and management of natural resources developed and approval secured</li> <li>6. Collaborative project management functioning</li> </ol>	<p><b>Indicators:</b></p> <p><b>Output 1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- By 2005, at least 15 CBO leaders (5 from each of the 3 selected sites) are trained in at least 3 NRM methodologies, namely, Problem Animal Management, Project Management, and Resource Assessment &amp; Monitoring; the leaders register a qualitative improvement in each area within their communities in accordance with criteria based on needs assessment</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONTINUED ON PAGE 2-3</b></p>	<p><b>To achieve Outputs/Results:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- District and Provincial Administration continues to be supportive of Project</li> <li>- Central Government remains supportive of Reserve, Zonation and options developed</li> <li>- Conflicts within and between communities are minimal in the three project sites</li> <li>- Communities in 3 project sites are willing and supportive of the establishment of NRM-based organisations</li> <li>- Regulations are approved by Ministry of Agriculture</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONTINUED ON PAGE 2</b></p>
<p><b>Project Activities:</b> See Detailed Listing in Project Document</p>	<p><b>Project Costs and Inputs:</b> See PAGE 3</p>	<p><b>To achieve Activities:</b> See PAGE 2 of this Matrix</p>

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	EXTERNAL FACTORS/ ASSUMPTIONS
<p><b>Project Outputs:</b></p>	<p><b>Indicators:</b></p> <p><b>Output 1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- By 2005, key resource management personnel in the Reserve (SRN) and at District and Provincial levels (2+16+4) will know aims and strategies of Niassa Reserve, the role of wildlife as a land use, and have general exposure to land use planning tools, problem animal management and fire management</li> <li>- District Administrators actively supporting the project, especially in situations of crisis</li> </ul> <p><b>Output 2:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- By 2005, at least 3 Resource management committees in each of the 3 villages covering such resources as fisheries, wildlife, beekeeping, timber and non-timber products are created through a participatory process, with responsibilities assigned to each member; these are able to perform up to 80% of the tasks as established in the TOR agreed by the communities</li> </ul> <p><b>Output 3:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- By 2005, zonation of Niassa Reserve for conservation and NRM proposed by SRN is fully endorsed and supported by all stakeholders</li> <li>- By 2003, at least 3 community level resource management options (e.g. fishing, beekeeping, tourism) are identified and developed in the 3 selected project sites by members of interest groups and implemented by 2005</li> </ul> <p><b>Output 4:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- By 2003, revenue sharing agreements for at least 3 resources (e.g. wildlife, fisheries and timber) are reached through a participatory process involving all stakeholders and are being used as a tool for revenue distribution in the 3 selected project sites</li> </ul> <p><b>Output 5:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- By 2003, regulations for hunting, agriculture, immigration, fishing and the use of timber (fuelwood, charcoal, building) have been developed jointly by CBOs and SRN and adopted by the Board and (if required) submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture for approval</li> </ul> <p><b>Indicators for Output 6:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All narrative and financial reports produced in time and submitted to appropriate offices by Project Partners</li> <li>- Bi-annual reports by Project Executant, Niassa and the Director of the Reserve reflect agreement in at least 90% of the issues from day 1</li> <li>- Conflicts and contradictions arising in the Project Team in the Reserve are locally resolved without reference to the SRN Board or WWF SARPO</li> </ul>	<p><b>To achieve Outputs/Results:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Access to markets for communities is favourable</li> <li>- Markets for natural resource products are maintained</li> <li>- Human population in the three project sites remains stable (+/- 20% from the figures in the year 2000) and settled in project area</li> <li>- Fiscal policy environment (i.e. taxation) remains favourable to equitable revenue sharing and acceptable to MoF</li> </ul> <p><b>To Achieve Activities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Weather conditions allow for smooth completion with minimum of delays</li> <li>- Timely delivery of goods and services by suppliers and service providers</li> <li>- Road conditions permit smooth operations with minimum delays and hindrance</li> <li>- Qualified staff can be recruited in time and willing to work in Niassa</li> </ul> <p><b>Pre-Conditions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Funding provided for CBNRM by donors</li> <li>- MoU between SRN and WWF (SARPO) signed before project start</li> </ul>

	<p><b><u>Additional Indicators for Project Goal:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The area of wildlife habit and numbers of selected species within sites managed by CBOs is maintained or increased as compared to 2001; Quality of habitat e.g. intact woodland remains unchanged as compared to 2001</li> <li>- Access to and availability of key natural resources for HH in project sites remains unchanged as compared to 2001 levels</li> <li>- As spillover effect, CBNRM activities are initiated in Nthimbu and other villages by communities cover an additional 500 HH</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Additional Indicators for Project Purpose:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CBOs make investments in cash and kind in NRM infrastructure and activities e.g. fence maintenance, trading facilities for NRM products such as honey and guinea fowls etc.)</li> <li>- By 2005, the number of reported illegal uses of land, wildlife and other resources in the 3 project sites declines to 20% of levels of baseline information in 2001</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>Project Costs and Inputs:</b>  <b>GOM= Reserve</b> (Contribution in kind)  <b>SRN= Personnel</b> (USD 90 000)  <b>NORAD= approx.</b> USD 730 000  <b>WWF Norway= USD</b> 182 000  <b>WWF SARPO= USD</b> 35 000</p>	

ANNEX 3  
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE MARCH 2004  
MID-TERM REVIEW

ASPECT	RECOMMENDATION
<b>Project Goals/Purpose</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Undertake as a priority full RUATs in all 3 villages</li> <li>- Emphasise field support activities in the 3 focal villages to NRM options (fishing, beekeeping, quota setting, timber/NTFP etc) and local NRM institutions (CBOs) such as both the NR Comites and specific resource use Associations.</li> <li>- Define with SRN the species and habitat baseline data for standardised collation and monitoring basis.</li> <li>- Provide emphasis to Negomano settlement field work</li> <li>- Retain current LFA/Project Document as project foundation (reach consensus with Norad on the minor Indicator revisions)</li> <li>- Develop future support strategy and proposal with SRN for post 2005.</li> </ul>
<b>Output 1 Training</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implement training programme based on needs identified in 2004. Translate SARPO 'Fire Manual'.</li> <li>- Concentrate on practical field trainers and village follow up. Not currently useful to re-visit formal 'needs assessment'</li> <li>- Establish piri-piri fencing/production demonstration pilots in at least the 3 focal villages</li> </ul>
<b>Output 2 NR and institutions baseline data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Do full RUAT in Mussoma and in Negomano and partial in Naulala (more emphasis on mapping and NR options for revenue generation, NR monitoring)</li> </ul>
<b>Output 3 Planning &amp; Zonation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Build and follow up on the 2003 scientific surveys and studies - SRN / FFI – eg monitoring system for fisheries catch size/effort.</li> <li>- Consolidate and collate community knowledge regarding land use options, zonations, resource status via RUATs (need GPS/GIS and wider mapping method improvements)</li> <li>- More knowledge needed on a) sustainability of NR use options (bee-keeping, fisheries, non-timber forest products, timber products), and b) markets for these options</li> </ul>
<b>Out put 4 NRM options</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Re-focus this output specifically to deal with developing NR options in the villages via village scale institutions (NR Comites, Associations).</li> <li>- Address wider revenue sharing process (20% of state royalties) as requested by SRN and as process/ regulations evolve.</li> <li>- Undertake development process for other NR options (e.g. palm products, piri-piri commercialisation and other timber (?) or non timber forest products)</li> <li>- Implement fisheries and bee-keeping further in the 3 focal village areas</li> <li>- Local (and external, if necessary) expertise to analyse sustainability and markets for fisheries, bee-keeping and other NR use options</li> </ul>
<b>Output 5 Regulations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- WWF to support dissemination of Land and Forest and Wildlife laws with WWF-team to facilitate discussion of these laws/rights in the 3 focal villages.</li> <li>- SRN to re-clarify any support needs on internal regulations or Management Plan process.</li> </ul>

	- Focus of institution/rule evolution through local and village practice and applied experimentation.
<b>Output 6 Project Management</b>	<p>WWF-team should have one more specific village officer(s) based in Negomano and headhunt new team leader</p> <p>Need for more field support /practical training from WWF SARPO <i>in situ</i> and specific practical training in bee keeping and other NR options.</p> <p>Improve documentation and dissemination of reports and studies.</p> <p>Equipment. Need to consider: second bush-mail or a sat-phone for clearer communication links; second motorbike and housing (Negomano), GPS for RUAT work.</p> <p>SRN and WWF MCO develop process of 3 month, 6 month and 12 month work-plans and progress report (M&amp;E) system</p>

## ANNEX 4 LIST OF PROJECT DOCUMENTS

### **Technical Documentation**

- Report by Alda Salomao (2003) Review of legislation relating to communities in PAs, options and recommendations (WWF/SRN Maputo). In Portuguese.
- Draft Report by Celia Meneses (2002) Internal Reserve Regulations
- Osborne and Anstey (2002) Reconnaissance Study for Training in PAC and Chilli Production for Niassa Reserve and Niassa Province. Workshop Mbatamila April 2002. WWF SARPO.
- Questionnaire survey results on a/ fisheries in Mussoma, b/ beekeeping in Mussoma/Naulala.
- Partial RUAT Report Negomano (draft)
- Quota Setting Process and Results for Naulala, Negomano and Mussoma (draft report by Team)
- Problem Animal Control Village Report form – draft and final formats.

### **Training Material**

- Translated into Portuguese – WWF SARPO Electric Fence Manual
- Translated into Portuguese – Living with Elephants; Human Elephant Conflict Control, Chilli Fencing and Chilli Commercialization by Osborne and Parker (2002).

### **Progress Reports and Work Plans**

- Annual Progress Reports by WWF MCO
- Annual and 6 month Workplans (2003 onwards)
- Reports on the 4 Training Courses given (drafts)
- Minutes taken by Project Team of meetings with Reserve Administrator, District Administrator and other government officials (2002 to present).

### **Contribution to Reports**

- Collaboration in producing formal RUAT reports for Naulala (Winblad 2003), Ntimbo (Cunliffe and Serra 2004), Matonovela (Serra and Cunliffe 2004), Negomano (Cunliffe, Serra, Manuel, Nandja, Rigava 2005).
- Collaboration on SRN fisheries study (Bills 2004)

## ANNEX 5 TERMS OF REFERENCE

### WWF Norway, WWF SARPO & WWF MCO

#### Niassa CBNRM Project 2001-2005

#### End of First Phase Project Evaluation

#### Terms of Reference

#### Project Background

An evolving framework in Mozambique is allowing for partnerships between the State, private sector and local communities to conserve biodiversity and to manage resources sustainably, has created considerable opportunities for rural communities to manage and benefit from the wildlife resources of Niassa. The SRN (Society for the Management and Development of Niassa Reserve), a joint venture partnership between the state (represented by DNFFB/DNAC) and a Mozambican non-profit private sector company, is presently the designated management authority in Niassa Reserve.<sup>2</sup>

With funding from NORAD, the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation, and together with SRN, WWF Norway and WWF SARPO through its Mozambique Coordination Office (WWF MCO) is supporting the implementation of a community (CBNRM) project in Niassa Reserve.

The project has the following objectives and outputs, which are based on SRN's identified objectives:

*Development Objective (Goal):* Local communities benefit from and maintain habitats and numbers of selected wildlife species in Niassa Reserve

*Immediate Objective (Purpose):* Community based organisations are actively managing natural resources in conjunction with the management authority in Niassa Reserve

*Outputs:*

1. NRM knowledge and skills of CBO leaders, resource managers and others at Provincial and District level improved
2. Community based organisations reviewed, developed and established
3. Participatory land use planning, zonation, and appropriate NRM options examined, selected and developed
4. Revenue sharing mechanisms developed and implemented
5. Regulations for the use and management of natural resources developed and approval secured

---

<sup>2</sup> Niassa Reserve as referred to here includes the adjacent and surrounding Buffer Zone of 5 hunting blocks.

## 6. Collaborative project management functioning

*Activities:* Detailed activities relating to these outputs are provided in project documents.

The initial phase of the project was designed to run for 5 years, 2001 to 2005. The project commenced in late 2001 with field start-up in April 2002. A mid term internal progress review<sup>3</sup> was undertaken in March-April 2004 and a final evaluation of the first 5 year phase of the project is now required in order to assess progress and project results as well as provide recommendations for the future.

### **General Background**

The aim of this section is to give a brief overview of aspects that have evolved in the wider context since the design in 2000 of the Project Document.

Although the first private sector-state initiative in Niassa Reserve started in late 1995, SRN as an institution is about 5 years old. The key priorities for SRN in this recent period have been:

- Establishing a presence in the Reserve such as infrastructure, personnel for management and administration (2002-4)
- Establishing partnerships and implementing studies to clarify options and the best way forward – including community options, biodiversity studies (reptiles, birds, small mammals and systematic large mammal aerial surveys. Much of this work has been done in 2002-3.

A draft Niassa Reserve Management Plan has now (late 2003) been produced (supported by WWF) and currently requires incorporation of the results of recent surveys and of internal Reserve regulations.

Legislation and ideas on CBNRM have also significantly evolved since 2000. The 1999 Forest and Wildlife Law of primary legislation has been strengthened through the issuing of the 2002 Regulations to the Law and currently (2004) new Decrees are in late draft form for the delegation of powers from the state to other entities (private or community) and for mechanism for distribution of 20% of state royalties (licences) for wildlife and forestry harvesting and concession fees to local communities.

---

<sup>3</sup> Mid Term Internal Progress Review Niassa Reserve Community (CBNRM) Project. Unpublished Report compiled by S Anstey et al. (2004). WWF SARPO Harare

Developments in community institutions for natural resource management (NRM) are noted in the new legislation and in DNFFB/IUCN/IIED recommendations for Decrees establishing the rights and responsibilities of 2 key community institutions:

- The Community Management Committee (or *CGC* – essentially a village scale institution). In the recommendations the CGC is the core institution made up of elective members of the community who are responsible for NR management, negotiated contracts with the private sector (based on their having land certificates and resource plans) and the additional holding and distribution of income resulting from the 20% fees or state royalties on harvesting in that community's area.
- The Council for Participatory Management (or *COGEP* a sub district level institution). The COGEPs are more an advisory and collaborative group with membership from the CGCs, district administration, private sector and NGOs.

In Niassa Reserve the period 2000 to 2004 has seen some re-orientation on sources of revenue for community distribution and ideas on appropriate institutional mechanism for revenue earning or use. The initial emphasis on re-distribution of SRN fees earned has been a one-off experiment and one in which a number of institutional complexities have arisen – accountability of funds, transparency of process and problems of roles/functions of NR Comites beyond proposing how 'their funds' might be used. The emphasis has since evolved that stresses more revenue resulting from the 20% community allocation of state royalties, with NR Comites to play a role in receiving such funds (which are likely to be relatively small given the current limited off-take or tourism ventures and thus licence fees) and in exploring mechanisms for community representation on the SRN Board.

One other feature relevant to the general context is the unusualness of a protected area (PA) with a fairly large resident population. This is rare in the region where CBNRM has focused on 'communal land' outside protected areas or on 'neighbour' schemes providing some roles and benefits to those communities living on the margins of PAs. However, in Mozambique the situation where people are resident in PA is now widespread (around 45,000 people) and the importance of CBNRM in PAs is of increasing importance. Thus CBNRM approaches developed elsewhere in the region around PAs or in communal land cannot simply be applied in such a context.

Niassa Reserve represents a 'model' or experiment for the Government in Mozambique as to those approaches that may be useful to learn from and adapt as policy for other PAs.

## **Objectives of the Evaluation**

The primary purpose of the end of phase evaluation is to assess the impact, effectiveness and relevance of the project in relation to its objectives, target groups, partners and other affected parties, and to assess project results.

## **Scope**

The evaluation should aim to focus on the following aspects of the project:

1. Evaluate the project in terms of its achievements and impact in respect of its goals and objectives by identifying specific accomplishments and/or failures attributable to the project.
2. Review the activities that have taken place and the resulting outputs, and determine the quality and impact of these.
3. The evaluation should take into consideration the original project document and the recommendations made following the mid-term review of 2004.
4. Review the project implementation strategy with particular reference to the relationship between SRN in Maputo and Niassa Reserve and the WWF Project team in Niassa and the WWF Mozambique Coordination Office in Maputo.
5. Attention should be paid to lateral and vertical communication between SRN, DNAC/DNFFB and WWF MCO as well as to the wider network communication network between WWF Mozambique, WWF SARPO and WWF Norway.
6. Define clearly the lessons gained from the experience of the project and provide recommendations that can be used in any further continuation or reorientation of the project, together with a definition of possible exit strategies.
7. Place the project in context by identifying efforts by other agencies contributing to implementation of sound natural resource management and community capacity building in the Niassa Reserve, such as provincial and transboundary initiatives, other related issues and incentives, bilateral assistance and other NGOs
8. Place the possible continuation of the project in context by identifying future development initiatives, business and management plans of SRN, as well as possible impact of regional issues such as infrastructure development on target project areas.

9. In the light of the findings of the evaluation, make recommendations for the continuation or otherwise of the project. Define broadly the nature of future interventions in terms of project focus, components, geographical area, target groups and implementation strategy.

### **Implementation**

The evaluation will be carried by an independent consultant who is a Southern African CBNRM specialist. The independent consultant will work with the WWF Coordination Office in Maputo, the Project Executant and his team, as well SRN field staff in Niassa Reserve and the SRN Director. S/he will consult also with local authorities, communities and senior staff of DNAC/DNFFB in Maputo.

The schedule below provides further details on the 18 day evaluation process, of which 9 days should be spent in Niassa Reserve. This schedule should be considered flexible in order to accommodate the presence of SRN and its planned meeting in Niassa Reserve.

### **Deliverables and Reporting Requirements**

The independent consultant will be responsible for undertaking separate consultations as appropriate and for producing the evaluation report, which will include a set of recommendations for a possible new phase of the Project. WWF representatives will provide insight into project administration processes and the necessary documentation required to respond to the issues raised in the scope of the work. The consultant will produce a 1st draft of the evaluation report by the 4th August and the final report by 12th August.

### **Costs**

The Consultant will be paid at a rate of ZAR3000 per day plus all expenses for a total of 18 days. An advance of 30% of this fee will be paid beforehand. The balance will be paid upon submission and subsequent approval of the final report, but not later than 20 August 2005. All fees due will be paid into a bank account nominated by the consultant.

### **Literature to be made available**

Literature available will be the Mid-Term Review Reports, previous annual reports, RUATs, Reports produced by consultants paid by the Project, Biodiversity studies, the Draft Niassa Management Plan, and others.

### Schedule for Final Evaluation

Date	Activity
19 July, Tuesday	Consultant arrives in Maputo Meeting with MCO
20 July, Wednesday	Fly Maputo-Nampula-Mbatamila Meetings with SRN staff and WWF project team at Mbatamila
21 July Thursday	Travel to Mussoma focal village; meetings with leadership, NR committees, associations, etc
22 July Friday	Travel to Naulala village; meetings with leadership, NR committees, associations etc
23 July Saturday	Travel to Mecula (District Centre); meeting with District Administrator and other District authorities
	Meetings with WWF project team at Mbatamila to analyse project Log Frame especially Outputs and Activities
24 July Sunday	Continuation of above meeting
	Mini-workshop with SRN personnel & WWF Project team
25 July Monday	Travel to Ngomano
26 July Tuesday	Meeting communities and local authorities in Ngomano
27 July Wednesday	Travel back to Mbatamila Wrap-up with Team and Niassa Reserve
28 July Thursday	Fly to Nampula
	Fly to Maputo
29 July Friday	Meeting with DNAC (senior staff) & SRN Feed-back to MCO
30 July Saturday	Fly back to Windhoek
4th August, Sunday	First draft of the Report/comments back to Consultant by August 10, Sunday
12 August	Final Report by Consultant