# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## ETR TAN1102711 KILORWEMP

**Objectives of the Review**

The End of Term review should support steering, contribute to learning, and provide a reasonable accountability response to the donor, partner and other internal actors by supplying an external assessment of the progress and results achievement. The learning should draw useful lessons for other interventions or for new policies, strategies and programmes. Equally, the review is expected to respond on the following evaluation field pertaining to project performance:

1. Generic evaluation field: Assessing performance of interventions by evaluating the relevancy, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.
2. Specific evaluation questions, in particular:
3. To what extent the recommendations done during the MTR were taken into account in the second part of the intervention? Did it contribute to the achievement of results and overall performance of the intervention?
4. To what extent capacities of LGAs, beneficiary CBNRM units were strengthened?
5. To what extent did the project lay the foundation for sustainable natural resource management of the Kilombero Valley Ramsar Site?

**Context**

The Kilombero Valley Wetlands are among four wetlands in Tanzania named in 2002 under the Ramsar Convention, with the aim of of ensuring wise use of resources. Along with the Lower Rufiji River, these wetlands attract various economic and investment categories: agriculture, pastoralism, wildlife, forestry, beekeeping fishing. The area is attractive due to its fertility, availability of rain and location on river catchments, which enables irrigation and year-round annual harvests. The wetland landscapes have high biodiversity values and provide critical ecosystem services to users of the river basin. It is in this context that the Government of Tanzania (GoT) designed and implemented the Kilombero Valley Ramsar Site (KVRS) project that ended in 2011, when its evaluation become a basis of KILORWEMP.

**Methodology**

The End of Term Review took place during July – September 2018. The key tools, based on a participatory approach, are as summarized as follows:

* A set of questions to answer the generic DAC criteria in standard donor methodology
* An itinerary and timetable of the evaluation, presented provisionally and revised during the field mission included: Document review at home bases; a field mission during July 2018 for consultation with a range of stakeholders and presentation of initial findings; further document review, report drafting and revision at home bases.
* Review of documents to assess planned vs realised achievement.
* Interviews and group meetings with key stakeholders. These consultations included:
  + Individual or small groups of actors depending their level of involvement e.g. DEDs, DCs, National Project Coordinator, District Facilitation Teams, etc.
  + Thematic group discussions with CBO members, eg BMUs, WMAs, and VFRs.
  + Physical visits to project areas or sites of sampled CBOs.
* Presentation of preliminary findings at a briefing workshop in Morogoro. Feedback from stakeholders, largely drawn from District teams, with some national authorities.
* Analysis and preparation of the draft report, and revision based on feedback received.

**Main findings**

***Relevance***

Given the high degree of coherence between the project design and the priorities of the beneficiaries, Partner government and donor government, the overall score for Relevance is **Very Satisfactory**. The only drawback is the low relative level of commitment to the natural resources sector by the Government of Tanzania, at a broad national level and in both budgetary and human resources, when compared to the urgent needs for conservation of natural ecosystems and ecosystem services.

***Efficiency***

Project efficiency was generally **Satisfactory**, since it was able to spend 79% of the budget as at 31st August 2018, with some delay in construction of buildings and finalisation of studies and the landscape-level Integrated Management Plan. it also ensured funds released to Districts were all spent for the planned purposes. However, some challenges were identified that reduced somewhat the opportunity for securing ownership of the project Outcomes.

***Effectiveness***

*Result 1: Key resource users (wildlife, forest, fisheries, land & water) are organized to manage their resource base on wise use principles within the framework of CBNRM*

Overall, the effectiveness of Result 1 Outputs and Outcomes was **Satisfactory**. The targets for registration of CBOs were largely achieved, governance capacities were improved, and lessons were learned and noted.

*Result 2: Key resource users, transformers and traders (wildlife, forest, fisheries) organized to derive sustainable economic benefits from CBNRM through access to markets and sound business management*

Overall, the effectiveness of Result 2 Outputs and Outcomes was **Satisfactory**. Only one CBO, Mtanza Msona VFR, achieved significant NR-based income that could be shared with its members, while some lessons were learned. The prospects for future revenue generation in CBFM look the most promising of the three CBNRM approaches. Scaling up should now be a priority.

*Result 3: Strengthened capacities of central, regional and local government structures to support and monitor the implementation of policies at local level and improved coordination between Natural Resource governance stakeholders at all relevant levels*

The challenges to the design and implementation of this Result area inevitably led to some shortfall in achievement and timely delivery of desired Outputs. However, it is to the credit of the PIU's efforts at re-design, and the functioning of the JPLC approval process, that it was possible to navigate a way forward in a good example of adaptive management, with the production of the IMP Foundation Plan a solid achievement. Achievement of the Result 3 Outcome was **Satisfactory**.

*Overall assessment of the project's Effectiveness*

The effectiveness of the project is variable according to the Results. With the effectiveness of Result 1 Satisfactory. Result 2 Moderately Satisfactory, and Result 3 Satisfactory, the overall assessment of Effectiveness is **Satisfactory**.

***Impact***

The three Result areas are linked to each other, with R2 dependent on successful implementation of R1, and elements of R1 depending on the enabling conditions developed under R3. Since the pathway from each one of these Results (via Intermediate States, subject to Impact Drivers and dependent on Assumptions) to the Specific Objective is considered Moderately Unlikely, the achievement of the Specific Objective, from it, the Overall Objective, and therefore the project's Impact, must also be considered **Moderately Unlikely**.

***Sustainability***

*Institutional*

Considerable capacity development occurred. Commitment by CGA and LGA to implementation of the IMP was voiced but not matched with financial and human resource allocation. The institutional sustainability of project Outcomes is considered Moderately Unlikely.

*Financial*

Government agencies at national and District levels cannot, at present, see their way to commit financial resources to project activities or plans, including the IMP, after its completion. At the same time, revenue streams from CBNRM have been slow to develop and, without upscaling, are modest. Other funding sources, such as donor agencies, NGOs or private sector operators are very limited or absent from the KVRS. Financial sustainability of project Outcomes is considered Unlikely

*Social/ economic*

The economic contribution of CBNRM to incomes in an essentially agricultural rural landscape is always going to be modest at the household level. At the same time, community-level enterprises are notoriously difficult to maintain in the face of often competing interests at the level of individuals and families. CBNRM development requires longterm commitment to succeed and upscale to significant levels. Socio-economic sustainability of project Outcomes to be Moderately Unlikely.

*Environmental*

While the project interventions were all aimed at improving environmental conditions, the overwhelming land use and human population pressures facing the environmental sustainability of natural resources in the KVRS and Lower Rufiji River have been beyond the ability of the project to resist, on its own. Environmental sustainability is considered Moderately Unlikely.

*Overall assessment of sustainability*

Given that the ratings for Institutional, Social/ economic and Environmental sustainability are Moderately Unlikely and for Financial sustainability is Unlikely, the overall Sustainability of project Outcomes is considered **Moderately Unlikely**.

**Specific Evaluation Questions**

***1. Recommendations by the MTR***

The main thrust of the recommendations was to focus the resources of project implementation more closely towards the achievement of the three Result areas, and thus towards the higher level project Objectives. The PIU responded positively to these recommendations, adopting all but one, which concerned intervention in Rufiji District, which appeared at odds with the recommendation of focus away from Rufiji and towards the KVRS. This was a contribution in the process of adaptive management.

**2. Capacity-building of LGAs and CBOs**

Capacity was built in LGAs and CBOs through provision and take-up of extensive infrastructure/ equipment and training provision. WMAs and CBFM sites moved forward with planning and business development and, while progress was slower in some BMUs, they also gained capacity. However, delays between initiation of activities and achieving real income generation were a source of frustration.

***3. Foundation for Sustainable NRM in KVRS***

The KILORWEMP made significant steps towards laying a foundation for sustainable NRM in the KVRS, but without serious commitment by the GoT at national and District levels, any gains could soon be lost.

**Conclusions**

***1. Mainstreaming***

Mainstreaming of the project is all about integrating the project into the respective beneficiary organisation. Sustainability is not guaranteed with mainstreaming, but it is impossible without it.

* The intervention modality by KILORWEMP was very successful in engaging LGA stakeholders
* Challenges of financial management procedures prevented full devolution and transparency
* Implementation allows practice, testing, adaptation, improvement of LGA governance
* But LGA partners failed to take on responsibilities of project activities when the project closed.
* Pilot interventions are essential but scaling up is additionally essential so that small areas of achievement become significant.

***2. NR sector challenges***

The natural resource sectors, apart from those resources officially protected in term of protected areas, generally receive a low priority in national and District budgets.

* Sustainable NR use is not considered a productive sector, despite large contribution to national and LGA economies. Natural ecosystems still seen as "undeveloped" land.
* Land use planning fails to support sustainable natural resource use
* Competing land use, generally agricultural, remains a major threat.

***3. Institutional development for CBNRM***

CBNRM projects face difficulties in achieving sustainability

* Community enterprises are intrinsically different from household enterprise, with unique governance challenges
* Land tenure and user rights are clearly fundamental.
* Agriculture is the basis of rural livelihoods; CBNRM is only likely to provide a supplement.
* Serious need for long term commitment for successful CBNRM model testing and scaling up.
* Need for national champions, in the NGO and private sectors.

***4. Wetland conservation***

Conservation of complex ecosystems like wetlands requires a multi-sectoral approach, with communication and a willingness to share responsibilities.

* Challenges to establish wetlands agency in GoT; Both MNRT and VPO are playing roles.
* KVRS is already degraded, urgently needs restoration, not simply protection of core KGCA.•
* Need a rudimentary "ballpark" analysis of the economic value of KVRS ecosystem services.

***5. Knowledge management***

Collection, storage, retrieval, and dissemination of knowledge generated during an intervention is essential for institutional memory

* Data collection, analysis and reporting is vitally important, project made a major contribution.
* Knowledge management promotes sustainability and impact achievement.

**Recommendations**

***1. Mainstreaming***

*Aimed at Enabel and other donors*

Mechanisms for sustainability of project outcomes and impacts should be an integral part of project design mainstreaming is a cornerstone of institutional and financial sustainability

*Aimed at Government at national and District levels*

Partner co-financing commitments should therefore include financial commitments, not just "in-kind" contributions of staff salaries and office premises.

***2. NR sector challenges***

*Aimed at Enabel and other donors*

Efforts should be made to get Partner recognition of the need to commit to conservation/ sustainable use as a pre-condition for financing agreements of projects in the NR sectors.

*Aimed at GoT at national and District levels*

The value of NRM must be recognised as an investment opportunity for generating revenue for parastatal agencies, to reduce rural poverty and to supplement District Council Own Source budgets.

***3. Institutional development for CBNRM***

*Aimed at Enabel and other donors*

Need must be recognised for long term commitment and either plan for multiple phases of interventions or design for engagement with other donors, NGOs and private sector organisations

*Aimed at GoT at national and District levels*

Incentives for NGOs and private sector partners should be encouraged and developed by the GoT, with streamlined and enabling regulations to reduce reliance on foreign donors

**4. Wetland conservation**

*Aimed at Enabel and other donors*

Economic value of the wetland ecosystem services to downstream activities, livelihoods and infrastructure must be documented and the case made to decision-makers.

*Aimed at GoT at national and District levels*

A single national agency, with convening authority, should be given a clear primary leadership and coordination role. GoT must decide if KVRS is worth saving, and devote sufficient resources to IMP.

**5. Knowledge management**

*Aimed at Enabel and other donors*

Knowledge management, storage and dissemination should be a fundamental part of all interventions

*Aimed at GoT at national and District levels*

Archiving, librarian and knowledge management systems should form an integral part of government agencies.