



FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

**FINAL EVALUATION OF THE REGIONAL COMMUNITY
BASED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
(CBNRM) CAPACITY BUILDING PROGRAMME FOR
SOUTHERN AFRICA**

Prepared for

**WWF Regional Office for Africa
(WWF-ROA), Nairobi, Kenya
C/O PMU, Lusaka, Zambia**

Prepared and Submitted by:

Anne M. Madzara¹ and Daulos D.C. Mauambeta²

10th December 2014

¹ Anne M. Madzara, Environment and Development Specialist, 14 Macilwaine Crescent, Lincoln Green, Belvedere, Harare, Zimbabwe; E-mail- annemadzara@gmail.com; Tel: +263 4 741184; Mobile: +263 772433913; Skype: madzara1.anne

² Daulos D.C. Mauambeta; Managing Partner Consultant, EnviroConsult Services; P.O Box 51374, Limbe, Blantyre, Malawi; E-mail: ddcmuambeta@africa-online.net; ddcmuambeta@gmail.com; Tel: +265 (0) 1 660002; Mobile: +265 (0) 999914540 / 888914540 / 999936699; Skype: daulos.mauambeta



FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name	Regional CBNRM Capacity Building Programme in Southern Africa
Project Location	WWF Country Office, Lusaka, Zambia
Project reference numbers: WWF-International: WWF-Norway: NORAD:	QZA-11/0893-20 (NORAD) 5125 (WWF-Norway) WWF-International:9F0751
Project budget	<i>USD 11 million (about 70 million NOK)</i>
Donor(s)/ funding sources	<i>NORAD/Ministry of Foreign Affairs via WWF-Norway</i>
implementing agency and partners	WWF – Regional Office for Africa
Contact person	Mwape Sichilongo

Start Date: <i>March 2003</i>	Expected End Date: <i>December 2014</i>
--------------------------------------	--

Network Initiative / Ecoregion Programme / Priority Place(s)³
Miombo Priority Place of Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Zambia, Zimbabwe and South of Tanzania The Coastal East Africa Global Initiative covering Mozambique, Tanzania and Kenya Namib-Karoo-Kaokoveld Priority Place covering Namibia and South Africa

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations	v
Acknowledgements	vii
Executive Summary	viii
1.0 Introduction	1
2.0 Project Description	1
3.0 Methodology.....	3
4.0 Findings.....	3
4.1. Relevance of the Programme	3
4.2. Impacts of the programme.....	5
4.3. Efficiency of the Programme.....	11
4.4. Effectiveness.....	14
4.5. Sustainability	16
4.6. Equity	18
4.7 Innovation and Best Practices	18
4.8. Replicability of the Programme.....	18
4.9. Lessons learnt.....	18
4.10. Implementation Issues and Challenges.....	20
5.0 Future Opportunities for CBNRM.....	20
6.0 Conclusions and overall assessment	23
7.0 Recommendations	24
Annexes to the Evaluation Report	26
Annex 1: Original Log Frame 2003.....	26
Annex 2: Revised Log Frame of 2012	29
Annex 3: Terms of Reference for the Evaluation	32
Annex 4: Evaluation Matrix	34
Annex 5: Work Plan (Time Table / Schedule)	38
Annex 6: List of people consulted.....	39
Annex 7: List of documents consulted.....	41
Annex 8a: List of funds mobilized by various Forums 2013-2014.....	44
Annex 8b: Sustainability of the Forum.....	46
Annex 9: Achievement Rating Scale	49
Annex 10 Highlights of Programme Achievements	58
Annex 11 Benefits from CBNRM Enterprises.....	62
Annex 12 MOMS Successes and Challenges.....	63
Annex 13 Conditions for successful replication of the CBNRM programme.....	63
Annex 14 Innovation and Best Practices.....	65
Annex 15 Case studies and Stories.....	66
Annex 16 Implementation Issues and Challenges	68
Annex 17 Biographies of Consultants.....	70
Biography for Anne Madzara	70
Biography for Daulos D.C. Mauambeta	71

TABLE OF TABLES

Table 1 Funds Disbursement 2003-2014 1
Table 2 Extent of reach of programme (Stakeholder engagement) 10
Table 3 Achievement rating by output 14

TABLE OF BOXES

Box 1 Policy Engagement by the Programme 7

ABBREVIATIONS

AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
BOCOBONET	Botswana Community Based Organizations Network
BWTI	Botswana Wildlife Training Institute
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Program
CAMPFIRE	Communal Areas Management Programme For Indigenous Resources
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBNRM	Community Based Natural Resources Management
CBO	Community Based Organization
CEAGI	Coastal East Africa Global Initiative
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
COPASSA	Conservation Partnerships for Sustainability in Southern Africa
CSABO	CBNRM Support Association for Botswana
CURE	Coordination Union for the Rehabilitation of the Environment
DWNP	Department of Wildlife and National Parks
EDETA	Enterprise Development and Training Agency
ESARPO	Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Programme Office
EIF	Environmental Investment Fund
ET	Evaluation Team
FR	Final Report
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GPF	Global Programme Framework
GMAAs	Game Management Areas
GvT	Government
HIV	Human Immuno-deficiency Virus
KCS	Karahari Conservation Society
KPI	Key Performance Indicators
LEAD SEA	Leadership for Environment and Development South East Africa
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis
M & E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MCA	Millennium Challenge Account
MOMS	Management Oriented Monitoring System
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NASCO	National Association for CBNRM Organizations
NEPAD	New Economic Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NR	Natural Resources
NRM	Natural Resources Management
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development
NOK	Norwegian Krone
PAC	Problem Animal Control
PME	Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation
PMU	Programme / Project Management Unit
RDCs	Rural District Councils
REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
RESLIM	Resilience programme for the Limpopo
RISDP	Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan
ROA	Regional Office for Africa
SACF	Southern Africa Community Based Natural Resources Management Forum
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SASSCAL	Southern African Science Service Centre for Climate Change and Adaptive Land Use
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Time bound

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

TFCA	Trans-Frontier Conservation Area
TLC	Total Land Care
TNAs	Training Needs Assessments
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
TNRF	Tanzania Natural Resources Forum
ToRs	Terms of Reference
TPR	Technical Progress Report
TWGs	Technical Working Groups
UNFCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USACOL	Upper Shire Association for Conservation of Liwonde National Park
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature
WWF-ROA	WWF Regional Office for Africa
WWF-ZCO	Zambia Country Office
ZAWA	Zambian Wildlife Authority

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Evaluation Team (ET) would like to first thank WWF for entrusting this work to them. Second, we would like to acknowledge the kind assistance we received from the Programme Management Unit (PMU) and all Country Forums to ensure smooth implementation of this evaluation. Specifically, at the PMU, we would like to thank Mr Mwape Sichilongo, Project Coordinator; Mrs Lilian Goredema the Operations Manager and Mrs Angela Lwanga, the Project Assistant for organizing all the logistics. We would like to acknowledge the kind assistance of Dr Nyambe Nyambe, the Country Director of WWF Zambia Country Office (WWF ZCO) and Mrs Mwaka Phiri the Project Finance Analyst for all the behind the scenes administration work pertaining to this evaluation.

We would also like to thank the Programme Advisory Board Members for taking their time to respond to our request for interviews. These include Dr Taye Teferi Regional Director for WWF Regional Office for Africa based in Nairobi, Kenya; Dr Nyambe Nyambe Country Director for WWF ZCO; Mrs Patricia Skyer Governance Advisor at WWF Namibia; Ms Melissa de Kock Senior Advisor for CBNRM and Climate Change Adaptation at WWF Norway based in Cape Town, South Africa; Dr Simon Anstey the Head of Terrestrial Programme, of the WWF Coastal East Africa Global Initiative, Tanzania; and Geoffrey Mwanjela, Programme Officer, Terrestrial Programme, WWF Coastal East Africa Global Initiative based in Tanzania. We would also like to thank the Chairman of the Southern African CBNRM Forum (SACF), Mr Mutuso Dhiwayo.

Thanks go to the following Country Forum Coordinators and Host Representatives for organizing all the country logistics during our visits to their countries: - Mr Felix Monggae and Mr Joseph Onkemetse of Botswana; Mr Reginald Mumba of Malawi; Ms Maxi Louis of Namibia and Mr Vincent Ziba of Zambia.

We also thank all the other Country Forum Coordinators and contact persons who were interviewed in different ways such as using Skype, questionnaires, and telephone calls because we could not hold face to face interviews with them. In this regard, we thank Dr. Cecil Machena of Zimbabwe CBNRM Forum; Mr. Geoffrey Mwanjela and Dr. Simon Anstey who provided information for the Tanzania Natural Resource Forum and Mozambique CBNRM Alliance respectively.

Finally, we thank all Country Forum Executive Committees and Forum Members, various Working Groups, Partners, Stakeholders and Community Groups too many to mention here for availing themselves for the interviews and briefing meetings which took place in each country.

Anne Mutsa M. Madzara

Daulos D.C. Mauambeta

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

NORAD provided 72.7 million NOK (approximately US\$11.8 million) over 11 years to implement the Regional Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) Capacity Building Programme in Southern Africa in six countries namely Botswana, Malawi, Namibia, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe. The programme ends in December 2014. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the achievement of the programme goal and purpose, and the extent to which the programme has benefited CBNRM principles, approaches and strategies and to explore future opportunities for scaling up CBNRM. The 35-day exercise involved a desk study, visits to four countries (Botswana, Malawi, Namibia and Zambia) and online interviews. The evaluation targeted forum members, advisory team, Programme Management Unit (PMU), secretariat, steering committee, development partners and communities. The report presents the findings and recommendations from the evaluation.

KEY FINDINGS

Relevance of the Programme: The programme was relevant to CBNRM stakeholders in participating countries, WWF's Global Programme Framework, (GPF), WWF-ROA Strategy, Southern African Development Community (SADC) Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan (RISDP), and WWF Norway's Strategy for support to WWF's Global Priorities 2012-2016, Norwegian Government's overseas development priorities and to multi-lateral environmental agreements.

Impact of the programme: Progress towards achieving the Goal of Improved rural livelihoods at the household level attained through sustainable management of natural resources by communities in Southern Africa was assessed. The programme contributed towards improved rural livelihoods in some sites as indicated by the positive social and economic changes that are directly associated with the programme activities. Income increased due to improved conditions for revenue flows to households, which were a direct result of lobbying by Forums. The programme strengthened the capacity of Community Based Organisations (CBOs) to engage in partnerships with private sector and to invest in sustainable natural resources management. CBNRM stocktaking and status reports produced by four countries confirm that the area under CBNRM has increased over the last 10 years. Attribution to this programme comes from experiences in specific sites that this programme directly supported. A direct impact attributed to the Management Oriented Monitoring System (MOMS) is increased responsibility by locals in 23 MOMS sites.

Attainment of the Project purpose: The project purpose was "CBNRM principles, policies and practices adopted as a mainstream strategy in Southern Africa for sustainable natural resource management in a manner that promotes equitable access to use and management of natural resources." The evaluation concludes that the project fulfilled this purpose. Participating countries have more explicitly incorporated CBNRM in national development plans in various ways. Botswana and Namibia now have stand-alone CBNRM policies whilst Malawi, Namibia and Zambia incorporated CBNRM into National Development Plans. CBNRM principles have been adopted in the mining (Zambia and Zimbabwe), agriculture (Malawi and Zimbabwe) and water (Malawi) sectors. More CBNRM CBOs are reinvesting in natural resources management from benefits derived from CBNRM in some specific sites across the region e.g. paying for anti-poaching effort, local people accompanying hunters, monitors and conservation personnel.

Value addition: The programme successfully facilitated the process of anchoring and reinforcing CBNRM policy and practice into Government structures and adoption of its principles in development plans. The programme created and formalised communities of

CBNRM practice at national and regional levels in the form of National Forums and SACF respectively. The programme initiated participatory mechanisms for measuring and recording the contribution of CBNRM using the Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) and MOMS. Although not yet in full use in most countries, these tools will provide accurate estimates of the contribution of CBNRM to national development. The programme created a platform for exchange of technical information. The Forum website has 27 types of guidelines/manuals that are available to the public. The programme has stepped up the participation of Community Based Organisations (CBOs) in national level debates and their contribution to the bigger picture through this programme. The programme also unlocked funding and opportunities for collaborative engagements at national and regional levels which otherwise would have stayed locked in the absence of the programme.

Extent of reach: The programme had a wide reach and sufficiently mobilised critical mass required to promote CBNRM. The programme reached 522 CBOs, 72 Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and 26 Government Departments; 47 donors; 15 academic institutions and over 72⁴ private sector investing partners (67 from Namibia and 5 from the rest of the other countries) sector partners. The public, students, professionals, development practitioners and communities benefit indirectly from unrestricted online and offline access to publications, manuals and guidelines.

Efficiency of the Programme: Funds were adequate and 90% of planned activities implemented. All seven Forums raised a combined US\$2.56 million to complement WWF Norway funds in the last four years. This provides a good measure of organizational capacity. The programme delivered good value for the 11-year investment given the regional scope, the range of activities implemented, stakeholders engaged and the multiplier effect of the programme. Allocating an average 22% of the annual budget to Institutional Strengthening (Output 1) was commendable given the relationship of this output to other outputs. The programme used very lean teams (PMU and Forum secretariats) and leveraged members' resources and thematic working groups. The leveraged in-kind contribution is 70% of the total funding contributed by NORAD in most countries. Processes and systems of project management were appropriate and where adjusted for maximum efficiency. 11 years was long enough to achieve the intended objectives. The flexibility in the log frame design, informed by internal and external reviews, allowed Forums to pursue relevant priorities in each phase. The programme pursued strategic partnerships with Government and development partners. PMU engaged with the SADC Secretariat through participation in Trans-frontier Conservation Areas (TFCA), wildlife and forestry meetings. However, the programme failed to secure formal engagement (signing of Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)) with SADC and other regional initiatives. Efficiency was compromised by a number of factors including - low funding that resulted in reduction in regional meetings, streamlining of Thematic Working Groups, limited rolling out of some of the innovative approaches such as MOMS and the Performance Monitoring and Evaluation framework, high staff turnover in key institutions and poor economic and policy conditions.

Effectiveness

Output 1: Institutional strengthening: The programme achieved this output partially. All countries established functional National Forums that are formally established and have a high chance of sustainability financially and operationally. There is reasonable guarantee that national Forums will be able to maintain a certain level of membership and activity. Each of the six forums has a strategic plan, which goes beyond 2015, and secured multiyear funding. All seven Forums have managed to mobilise funding from other sources totalling US\$2.56 million during the consolidation phase for various activities.

⁴ NACSO in Namibia incorporates 24 Tour Operators and 43 trophy hunting private companies

Although the programme failed to engage private sector investors effectively for forum membership and for strengthening national CBO associations, a wide range of stakeholders from government, NGOs, CBOs and academia were engaged through the Forums. The programme did not achieve plans for SACF's transition into an independent entity. Although SACF is recognised regionally and has a stream of initiatives that give it a regional stature, its continued existence as an unregistered entity will compromise its future and ability to continue to coordinate regional activities. There is assurance from PMU that the registration of SACF will be completed soon. However, this has come too late and SACF may need hand holding for over one year after the project end for it to fortify once it is registered.

Output 2: Consolidating best practices and capacity building in core CBNRM processes by December 2014. (a) Practical tools & applications: The forum collected 27 manuals and posted on its website. The Forum produced 30% of these manuals. The Forum also conducted four regional exchange visits and eight regional workshops. Training workshops were organised and nine modules used to guide training. The Forum implemented six best practices. These include Management Oriented Monitoring Systems (MOMS), Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) systems, Community Based Organisations (CBO) governance, policy engagement and advocacy, revenue sharing and Private/Public/Community partnerships. This output was therefore, largely achieved.

Output 2: (a) Consolidating best practices and capacity building in core CBNRM processes by December 2014. (b) Cross-cutting issues thematic areas- including Gender, HIV & AIDS and Climate Change mainstreaming: There was very limited achievement of this output with extensive shortcomings. The Forum conducted a regional study on Gender and HIV and AIDS mainstreaming. However, the Forum did not incorporate recommendations from the study into its activities. Two countries conducted mainstreaming training and Zimbabwe has a gender institution participating as a member of the Forum. Beyond this, there is little else to show for efforts towards mainstreaming gender. Information from the programme is not gender disaggregated neither is there effort to develop and implement initiatives specifically targeting or addressing women or men separately. There was considerable effort though by Forums towards engaging in Climate Change policy development and other initiatives e.g. collaboration with OXFAM (Zambia), LEAD SEA and Southern African Science Service Centre for Climate Change and Adaptive Land Use (SASSCAL). However Forums need to engage in a more inward facing approach of mainstreaming climate change where ongoing and future CBNRM initiatives are "climate change proofed" and designed to address climate change.

Output 3: Performance Monitoring, Evaluation and Dissemination: (i) MOMS was a flagship intervention of the programme implemented in 23 sites across five new MOMS countries (excluding Namibia). The target of engaging 50% of the CBOs in MOMS was ambitious. Nevertheless, the Forum made considerable progress with presence in each country. Five countries (Botswana, Namibia, Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe) have functional MOMS teams involving community members overseeing activities in various MOM sites. Namibia has at least 50 sites. Botswana has five MOMS sites in protected areas and problem animal control (PAC) sites (4 Ngamiland CBOs and 1 in Chobe). Malawi has 12 sites - wildlife (6), forestry (1), fisheries (2), birds (2) and catchment management (Berdo Ntcheu 1). Zimbabwe piloted in two wildlife areas namely (Masoka and Mbire) whilst Mozambique had one site. Zambia had three sites in wildlife (3 game management areas), bee keeping and conservation farming projects. The Forum evidently piloted MOMS in a wide range of sectors. In all countries MOMS is providing useful information for problem animal control, assessing status of fish, birds and trees including rare species, fence maintenance, anti-poaching, assessing the impact of human wildlife conflict and degradation status of landscapes. Piloting and rolling out of MOMS were both constrained by limited resources, high staff turnover and, in some instances, data overload.

(ii) *Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (PME)*: The PME user manual and the framework for identifying indicators for national level CBNRM monitoring were an innovation of the programme. The national PME Frameworks developed were also a positive contribution towards accounting for CBNRM's impact. However, there was no implementation done because the Forum developed the frameworks too late. This should be part of ongoing work for Forums to support wide scale adoption of the user manual and framework. If not implemented, the countries will lose the good work. The other risks of not implementing PME are that future CBNRM status reports will always have sketchy data. This will make the marketing of CBNRM as a development tool difficult.

Output 4: Policy development and implementation: Policy engagement by national Forums was an exceptional achievement of the programme. Forums were involved in policy reviews, development, advocacy and implementation in five areas. Botswana and Namibia now have CBNRM Policies and the Forums are taking lead in policy implementation. CBNRM appears in national development plans of Namibia, Zambia and Malawi. Forums were involved in policy reviews, development, advocacy and implementation in areas where CBNRM is relevant or is likely to be affected i.e. in climate change adaptation and mitigation, constitutional review, forestry, wildlife, energy, water, and mining.

Output 5: Conclude support to select existing partner training institutions: The Forum engaged 15 academic institutions. The programme influenced curriculum reforms in Botswana, Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe. The programme made reviews and developed formal curricular for CBNRM for Malawi College of Fisheries, Zambia Forestry College, and the Wildlife College in Zimbabwe. The programme developed and used CBNRM tools effectively and widely. For examples, colleges and universities in all the countries were using CBNRM Guidelines as reference materials. Malawi was using the MOMS Manual extensively, and was translating them into the local language. Future demand for formal training will largely depend on the job market for CBNRM, which is partly a responsibility of practitioners to promote CBNRM across sectors.

Sustainability: National Forums were established, are active, have secretariats, developed strategic plans most of which span up to 2016, and have raised funds to implement activities beyond December 2014. There is high probability that all Forums in seven countries will continue to exist beyond the programme. However, none of the Forums (including the registered ones) has moved away from their hosting institution. The decision is between the Forums and their hosting institutions. Hosting institutions and Forums have a mutually reinforcing relationship, and because of this fact, all of the Forums are likely to continue their operations beyond WWF support. All the Forums are strong enough in their own right in their respective countries. Two Forums, Malawi and Zimbabwe, have developed websites. However, four Forums have not raised sufficient institutional funding despite raising funds for project activities. The sustainability of SACF is of concern. Though it has regional presence, a strategic plan, website, a stream of publications and guidelines and a steering committee, the regional steering committee still needs to attend to sustainability beyond 2014. The ET recommends continued support to allow SACF to firm its position once registered.

Innovation and Best Practices: The programme promoted a number of innovations and best practices. These include the establishment of Thematic Working Groups, which was a step towards establishing a CBNRM community of practice and the Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) framework and user manual. In terms of financing, possible innovations still under development include the proposed mobilisation of local resources from training fees by the Zambian Forum, levying sectors that utilise natural resources as a form of payment for ecosystem services (PES) being proposed in tobacco farming in Malawi and the setting up of a CBNRM Trust Fund in Namibia. In terms of monitoring at community level, the programme promoted standardisation of CBNRM

monitoring across the region through MOMS. In terms promoting capacity for CBNRM in Government and in communities, the standalone CBNRM institution in Government in Botswana and the CBO/NGO coalitions in Namibia are significant examples.

Replicability: The programme is highly replicable. There is need to replicate the approach to strengthen civil society and promotion of partnerships and coalitions for knowledge sharing, learning and advocacy around several issues. This includes MOMS, incorporating CBNRM into mining, energy, water and other sectors across the region and in Africa. Replication needs champions, funds, and willingness to change and adapt to different contexts.

Lessons learnt: The ET has identified a number of lessons from this programme. Approaches to strengthening forums, forming CBO coalitions for effective advocacy, innovative financing and leveraging resources from members are areas for learning. The initially hypothesized relationship between Forums registration status and sustainability of Forums proved worth of further learning. The programme also provided insights into importance of separation and clarity of roles between forums and members; how interactions with communities during data collection can raise expectations for compensation and motivation for private investors' participation in CBNRM national policy dialogue. There is need for Forums to be aware of the possibility of "elite capture" where the more advantaged people in the community take over the enterprises and disenfranchise the less advantaged members of the community. The ET has drawn lessons from the difficulties experienced in promoting CBNRM training in higher-level training institutions. The ET has further identified at least ten case studies for development from the experiences under this programme.

Implementation Issues: Policy shifts due to changing politicians, disharmony between country positions on hunting, agrarian and mining reforms that were unfavourable to CBNRM operations were some of the key external implementation issues. Internal implementation issues included high staff turnover especially in partner organizations who were participating in Forum Working Groups, continuous skills leakages in the Forums, inconsistent participation of some Government members in forum activities, and Thematic Working Groups (TWGs) not functioning as desired. Lean secretariats at all levels were desirable. However, in the process of institution building, and as forums get new projects on board, the demands on a one-person secretariat proved intense.

Future Opportunities for CBNRM: The issues that the programme has been dealing with will always remain relevant as long as the political landscape keeps changing. While there is need to think over and plan for a future CBNRM with one less tool in the basket – hunting, the CBNRM community needs to proactively counter the anti-sustainable use campaigns using sustainable use principles and practices provided for by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and actual evidence on the ground. Incorporating CBNRM into Climate Change and related Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) and Payment for Ecosystems Services (PES) initiatives, land use planning and landscapes management, agriculture, energy, water, green economy initiatives are some of the opportunities. For Climate change, the approach needs to be more inward looking i.e. designing CBNRM initiatives that answer to climate change pressures instead of simply concentrating on mainstreaming CBNRM into Climate Change. Both approaches are worth pursuing though. There are opportunities for extending the geographical scope of CBNRM into other eco regions and countries.

Recommendations: The ET has proffered a set of recommendations. The national Forums should maintain secretariats beyond 2014, that are lean and well-resourced to take on three key roles namely membership management, fundraising and technical coordination. Forums should engage investors seriously. SACF should conclude its

formalization and renew efforts to engage with regional initiatives especially SADC. National Forums and SACF should update websites regularly with current information; incorporate use of other social media such as WhatsApp, Twitter, Skype and Facebook as part of knowledge management. Documenting best practice from the nine topics identified in this evaluation is important as well as operationalizing performance monitoring. SACF should mobilize resources for MOMS and explore options for an IT based MOMS data collection system. SACF needs to establish a clearinghouse mechanism and work towards becoming a CBNRM information, communication and publicity regional powerhouse. Facilitating virtual meetings of the steering committee regularly would be more cost effective in the meantime. WWF-ROA should consider hosting SACF with minimum support costs to enable it to fortify in its new structure perhaps for one year.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In September 2014, WWF-ROA commissioned the end of programme review of the Regional Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) Capacity Building Programme in Southern Africa. Funded by the Norwegian Government, through the WWF Norway to WWF-ROA with additional funding from USAID through WWF in Namibia, the Forum implemented the programme over 11 years between 2003 and 2014.

The WWF Norway funding ends in December 2014. To fulfil the reporting requirements by WWF and NORAD and the learning needs for the stakeholders who participated in the programme, this external evaluation was commissioned to assess the achievement of the programme purpose and goal, and the extent to which the programme has benefitted CBNRM principles, approaches and strategies and to explore future opportunities.

The report presents the results of the external evaluation of the 11-year programme. The programme carried out four other external evaluations over the life of the programme - the end of Inception Phase evaluation conducted in 2005⁵, Implementation Phase mid-term review in 2008⁶, an Assessment in 2009⁷ and a Consolidation Phase mid-term review in 2012⁸. The Programme used findings from each evaluation to refine the design of subsequent phases. The ET has presented the findings from this evaluation on each of the evaluation objectives followed by conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation made special emphasis on sustainability of the outcomes and future opportunities for CBNRM in the region.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The programme was implemented in six countries namely Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe. South Africa was included in the original project design but due to internal issues, it never came on board. The programme did not directly support Tanzania but was engaged in programme activities. Tanzania participated in meetings and its CBNRM Forum is now part of the Regional CBNRM Forum. NORAD disbursed 72.7 million NOK (approximately US\$11.8 million) over 11 years (Table 1). The programme received the following funds disbursed in three phases as follows:

Table 1: Funds Disbursement 2003-2014

Phase	Years	Total Budget (NOK)	Total Budgeted (\$US)
Inception Phase (3 years)	2003-2005	13,449,199.40	2,093,000.00
Implementation Phase (3 years)	2007-2009	31,651,691.87	4,970,429.00
Consolidation Phase (5 years)	2010-2014	27,610,596.00	4,695,157.00
Total	11 years	72,711,487.27	11,758,586.00

The goal of the programme was:- *“Improved rural livelihoods at the household level attained through sustainable management of natural resources by communities in southern Africa.”*⁹ The programme Purpose was: *“CBNRM principles, policies and practices adopted as a mainstream strategy in Southern Africa for sustainable natural resource management in a manner that promotes equitable access to use and management of natural resources.”* The External Evaluation recommended for the modification of the goal and purpose overtime simply to clarify the statement of intention and there was no major divergence from original purpose. The ET assessed the programme on the following project outputs of the last phase:-

⁵ Jones, Nanchengwa and Haarklau, (2005)

⁶ Whist, Chanda Lengwe and Murphree (2008)

⁷ Matakala, Patrick and Steve Johnson,(2009)

⁸ Swennenhuis and Madzara (2012)

⁹Goal as stated in the original project log frame was “Contributing to poverty alleviation and sustainable livelihoods at rural household level from management of natural resources by communities in Southern Africa” and the Purpose as stated in the original log frame was “CBNRM adopted as a mainstream strategy for rural development in Southern Africa”. The modification helped to clarify focus and there was no material divergence from the original intention.

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

- Output 1: Strengthening institutional capacity of regional forum, national forums and thematic working groups (including supporting resource mobilisation activities to contribute to the Forums' sustainability)
- Output 2: Consolidating best practices and capacity building in core CBNRM processes by December 2014 - (a) Practical tools & applications (b) Cross cutting issues thematic areas-including Gender, HIV & AIDS and Climate Change mainstreaming
- Output 3: Performance Monitoring, Evaluation and Dissemination
- Output 4: Policy development and implementation
- Output 5: Conclude support to select existing partner training institutions

The original programme log frame had the following five expected outputs¹⁰ as stated in the original document (Annex 1); and was revised in 2012 (Annex 2).

1. Regional Forum for sharing best practices, information and carrying out peer reviews made operational and establishment/strengthening of Peer Review Fora supported at country level
2. Appropriate CBNRM training supported in formal and non-formal institutions
3. Strategic institutional capacity-building of focal organisations involved in CBNRM in the public, private sectors, civil society and community levels implemented in the partner countries
4. Policy and legislation support provided at country level to promote and improve implementation of CBNRM with linkage to regional sectoral policies and trans boundary initiatives
5. Strategic interventions implemented (HIV/AIDS, crosscutting, emerging issues, gender issues etc).

WWF implemented the programme in three phases - an inception phase (2003 - 2005), an implementation phase (2007 – 2009), and a consolidation phase (2010-2014). The Programme Management Unit (PMU) split between WWF offices in Lusaka and Harare coordinated the programme and facilitated the establishment and strengthening (where they already existed) of national CBNRM Forums. The national Forums collectively form the Southern African CBNRM Forum (SACF) and its Steering Committee. The programme also facilitated and supported the operations of six Thematic Working Groups (TWGs) as part of the national and regional Forum to implement regional and national level innovative activities in the development of CBNRM. These were Policy Working Group, Training Working Group; Community Based Enterprise (CBE) Working Group; Community Based Organisations (CBO) Working Group; Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) and Management Oriented Monitoring System (MOMS) Working Group.

The Forum conducted four external evaluations in 2005, 2008, 2009 and 2012. The main recommendations from these evaluations were -

- a) Developing a clear exit strategy and increase focus on mobilising long term funding
- b) Increasing capacity of PMU and changing location of the coordination office
- c) Reviewing processes of funds disbursement to shorten the transfer chain
- d) Mainstreaming gender and increasing links to climate change
- e) Negotiate relationship with SADC
- f) Revising the log frame to clarify goals and set realistic targets and review risks and assumptions
- g) Combine Thematic Working Groups in view of reduced funding and new priorities and commit more funds to Policy engagement
- h) Assess impact of training and consolidate support to key training institutions
- i) Develop strategic plans and closely monitor key performance indicators in the log frame

¹⁰. The outputs stated here are those stated in the original 2002 proposal document. Again, although these were modified to respond to the context and priorities identified by end of phase evaluations, the components remained the same.

- j) A final phase to consolidate gains from the inception and implementation phases, the consolidation phase, should focus on CBNRM policy processes, PM&E, mainstreaming HIV and AIDS and gender, fund raising and sustainability.

The PMU and Forums diligently incorporated most of the recommendations from these evaluations as reflected in the Logframe, budget allocations, structural changes and workplans of each phase.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

WWF-ROA commissioned this end of programme evaluation on the 4th of August 2014. The ET conducted the evaluation over 35 days ending on 30th September 2014. A team of two independent consultants carried out the evaluation, supported by the Programme Management Unit, Forum Coordinators in each of the countries and guided by the TORS (Annex 3), an evaluation matrix (Annex 4) and a work plan (Annex 5).

The evaluation compared actual progress against targets set using the Consolidation Phase log frame. It was based on the findings and factual statements gathered from a review of relevant documents i.e. project proposal, Logical Framework Analysis (LFA), Annual Work Plans (AWP), Key Performance Indicators (KPI), semi-annual and annual Technical Progress Reports (TPR), quarterly and annual Financial Reports (FR) and other documents and reports produced by the programme. The ET visited four of the six participating countries, namely, Botswana, Malawi, Namibia and Zambia. The ET obtained information on the other two countries Mozambique and Zimbabwe through email communication and Skype interviews. The ET referred to Tanzania and Kenya in assessing impact of the programme even though programme did not support the two countries. In three of the four countries visited, the ET conducted visits to project sites to gather in depth information and evidence on various thematic areas of the evaluation. In each of the countries visited, the ET met with selected members of the Forums representing the secretariat, host institution, steering committee, thematic working groups, and partners. The ET concluded each visit by a debriefing session attended by Forum members. The ET interviewed the programme advisory team through Skype. In total, the ET interviewed 80 people representing various interests (Annex 6) and reviewed various documents listed in Annex 7.

The raw data from the individual countries is available as field notes. These were submitted to the Forums in each country visited during debriefing sessions and were used as the basis for analysis and for drawing broader conclusions of this evaluation. These notes are available in a separate set of documents for reference.

The evaluation process was constrained by a slow response to emails requesting information; non-response from South Africa and Mozambique, non-attendance to scheduled meetings by targeted interviewees in Lusaka, Lilongwe and Windhoek, a general lack of updated quantitative data to assess the status of indicators in the log frame, and limited time to visit project sites. The ET took appropriate remedies to address these challenges. For example, the ET had to do an in-depth review of country documents and crosschecked information with other relevant authorities. With this, the ET is confident that the findings of the evaluation depict the true picture of the status and results from the programme.

4.0 FINDINGS

4.1. Relevance of the Programme

Generally, the programme addressed a range of issues that were facing CBNRM at the turn of the century after almost 10 years of implementation. The general view is that the programme is highly relevant. Initially governance issues such as capacity constraints, conflicting legislation and implementation, institutional weaknesses, lack of clarity of roles and responsibilities, absence of a collaborative body at both national and regional level, unrealistic expectations, weak access to community rights/resources, top-down approach to CBNRM, were paramount at local and national level. Across the region the key challenges faced by many countries included, the lack of space for sharing common information; lack of working definitions, few models, concepts and standards of CBNRM; different levels of devolution; weak training and learning

capacity; weak advocacy and policy influence and weak regional business collaboration at community level. This programme has contributed solutions to these challenges.

The programme came in at a time when the pilot concepts of CBNRM largely supported by USAID were ready for up scaling. By 2000, CBNRM had shown signs of efficacy and there was a new need to extend its influence across the region and to other areas in each country. In pursuing a CBNRM, best practice up scaling and continuous improvement agenda for sustained benefits, the capacity (of CBOs and NGOs) and inadequate policy environment revealed themselves as limiting factors. There was need to build capacity of new players, strengthen the regional capacity to share information, lessons, models and best practices.

In general, the findings show that the programme was relevant to all countries and to WWF's Global Programme Framework (GPF), the then WWF ESARPO's (now Regional Office for Africa ROA's) Strategy, Southern African Development Community (SADC) Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan (RISDP), and to multi-lateral environmental agreements (United Nations Conventions on Wetlands, Biodiversity, Climate Change, CITES and Desertification). A detailed analysis of relevance to each of these levels is as follows:

(i) *Relevance to participating countries:* All countries acknowledged that the programme was relevant and was building on previous programmes, and addressed issues of capacity especially of CBOs that were affecting the success of earlier CBNRM initiatives. The establishment of CBNRM coordinating mechanisms in all countries brought substantial change to CBNRM profiling. Coordination mechanisms had been weak or absent and were in need of addressing. A lot was happening in the region, efforts were isolated and there was need for a platform to facilitate exchange and learning across the region which this programme provided. According to stakeholders, the need for a regional platform will always be there and hence the urgency in ensuring that SACF continues beyond the life of the programme. The establishment of Forums in Kenya and Tanzania is testimony to the relevance of the programme's intervention beyond the participating countries.

The 11-year programme had high significance with respect to increasing the voice, accountability and responsiveness within the local context in many respects. There was need to continue to profile CBNRM as a strategy for sustainable natural resources management and utilisation and poverty reduction – given the environmental conservation and poverty challenges that most countries are facing. Development challenges such as high levels of illiteracy and poverty, gender disparities, HIV & AIDS, environmental degradation including deforestation, overfishing and poaching in the region are dynamic requiring continuous review of strategies, creating resonance in policies, exchange of best practice and up scaling aspects, which this programme tried to deal with in the last 11 years. For continued relevance, there is need to explore the future opportunities for CBNRM particularly broadening its scope of application as a solution to emerging challenges and development solutions. This issue is subject for exploration in this evaluation.

(ii) *Relevance to WWF ROA's Strategic Objectives:* CBNRM principles are critical to so many initiatives under WWF. The programme has kept CBNRM alive in WWF programming. The geographical focus of this programme mirrored well with the spatial distribution of WWF Programmes and projects in southern and eastern Africa. For example, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Malawi focused on the Miombo woodlands while Namibia and Botswana focused on the Namib-Karoo-Kaokoveld. These ecosystems form WWF's priority geographical focus in the SADC Region. The programme also put a common thread through some of WWF's seemingly isolated programmes such as Conservation of Landscapes, Coastal Areas and Marine parks; Conservancy programme in Namibia, Game Management Areas (GMAs) in Zambia and the Protected Areas Management in Coastal areas of Kenya, Tanzania and Mozambique. Creating an enabling environment – strengthening governance, institutions, laws and policies is one of the four WWF ROA's strategic objectives. Under this objective WWF's intention is to empower civil society to engage in policy analysis, advocacy and influence; promote a policy environment

conducive to sustainable and equitable economic growth and to address governance failure by strengthening institutions working towards natural resource governance regimes.

(iii) *Relevance to WWF Norway:* This programme was one of the many means of achieving WWF Norway's International Development Work for the period 2009 to 2011, WWF Norway's Strategy for support to WWF's Global Priorities 2012-2016 and the WWF Norway Strategy 2013-2016. The programme strongly supported the Living Forest and Wildlife focal area, which intends to improve benefits to people and biodiversity through sustainable management of natural resources. Further, the programme contributed to WWF Norway's commitment to strengthening the role and responsibility of Civil Society Organisations to contribute to improved governance in relation to CBNRM policy, legal and institutional framework and more sustainable and equitable management of natural resources at local and national levels.

(iv) *Relevance to the Norwegian Government:* Since 2000, Norway's overseas development support towards environment has focused on integrating environmental and poverty reduction objectives in a way that makes it possible to define environmental goals more explicitly in relation to overarching development goals and poverty reduction. Development cooperation also aimed to facilitate the involvement of non-governmental organizations and various groups in the community in efforts to build a well-functioning society¹¹. The white paper to Parliament St. meld. 13 (2008-2009) on Climate, Conflict and Capital and another St. meld. 14 (2010-2011), towards Greener Development, signalled increased commitment by the Government of Norway to environment and climate change issues. Largely this programme has contributed to these development priorities in the environment and natural resources management and civil society sectors during the period 2000-2011.

(v) *Relevance to the SADC region development priorities:* Several SADC initiatives have space for CBNRM rendering the programme highly relevant. The regional inter-governmental initiatives such as the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan (RISDP) on natural resource management, TFCAs, SADC Protocol on Wildlife, regional Climate Change Strategy and NRM initiatives such as the Trans frontier Conservation Areas (TFCAs) have space for CBNRM. However, the programme failed to engage formally (signing of MOUs) with SADC and other regional programmes. This should be ongoing work for SACF beyond 2014.

(vi) *Relevance to other development partners:* Issues of governance, community participation, inclusive development and benefits to the poor remain at the core of most development partners' programmes. This was a key focus area of the programme. The fact that other development partners were able to contribute US\$2.56 million to complement programme resources signifies the importance and relevance of the programme to these partners.

4.2. Impacts¹² of the programme

4.2.1. Attainment of the Goal

(i) *Attainment of the Goal:* The programme intended to contribute towards improved rural livelihoods and sustainable natural resources management as measured by (i) benefits generated by households, (ii) the number and diversity of enterprises, and (ii) the area under management. The major challenge in evaluating the goal (and the purpose) was lack of quantitative data to assess the indicators stated in the log frame. There were a number of other initiatives that were taking place in the same period that complemented/or were complemented

¹¹ Report on Norwegian Development Cooperation in 2000 available on <http://www.regjeringen.no/en/archive/Bondeviks-2nd-Government/ministry-of-foreign-affairs/Rapporte>

¹² For the assessment of impact this evaluation used the framework of the original proposal document submitted to NORAD in October 2002. The consultants are aware of the changes to the framework that took place in subsequent phases. The 11 year vision set out by the project has not changed in principle.

by this programme. The ET relied more on the last set of status/stocktaking reports, previous technical progress reports and evidence gathered during site visits conducted in the four countries.

The ET established that the programme contributed to some of the positive social and economic changes associated with CBNRM that were experienced in the last 11 years. The ET discusses the extent to which the programme made impact for each measure of success below.

(ii) *Benefits from cash income, employment, and in-kind benefits:* The programme was designed to create a conducive environment for CBNRM to generate benefits. There is a widely shared view that the programme has contributed towards improving conditions for increased revenue flows to households. Communities have benefited from improvement in revenue sharing mechanisms, which were a direct result of lobbying by Forums. In Malawi, USACOL communities in Liwonde have started benefiting from revenue from the national park. In Botswana and Zambia, the Forums managed to keep the revenue sharing debate alive compelling authorities to maintain some system for revenue sharing. Exchange of experiences across the region exposed selected groups to new opportunities for enterprise and motivated new investment into CBNRM enterprise e.g. honey production in Mount Mulanje (Malawi), baobab fruit juice production in Luangwa (Zambia) (Annex 11). The programme strengthened the capacity of CBOs to engage in partnerships with investors to access markets. The African Parks Majete partnership, joint ventures for various CBOs in Ngamiland Botswana and the new partnerships in plantation forestry with the Timber Producers Association in Zimbabwe are some of the direct impacts of the programme. In-kind benefits have been widespread including improved housing, access to water, infrastructure support, fencing to curb human wildlife conflict and establishment of agricultural schemes in Botswana, Namibia and Zambia.

Although direct improvements in income have not been uniform across the region (and not all of them can be attributed to the programme), the influence of the programme on revenue sharing mechanisms will have widespread impact across the region through adding new models for revenue sharing. In Namibia, conservancies retain 100% of the revenue generated from hunting and other related activities. In Malawi, the Liwonde-USACOL model where locals benefit directly from Parks generated revenue is a unique revenue sharing model. Inconsistent policies on land tenure, devolution and revenue sharing, limited capacity of CBOs to deal with challenges, slow disbursement of revenue shares, and limited investment in product and market development present enterprise viability challenges. As experience from the programme has proved, Forums can make positive influence on the operating environment of CBNRM enterprises up to a certain limit. High-level politics (e.g. policy shift in Botswana and Zimbabwe) many times takes precedence. This is an area for continued work of forums to establish convergence of thought and vision between CBNRM practitioners and governments. This requires effort and time for ongoing relationship building. Namibia provides good examples of strong Government and Civil Society partnerships in this regard.

(iii) *Increase in the number and diversification of CBNRM enterprises:* CBNRM has seen a focus shift from wildlife to other resources thereby increasing the number and diversity of CBNRM enterprises. Whilst this general shift may not be totally attributed to the programme, site specific information shows that the programme influenced diversification. The awareness created and lessons shared through publications and exchange visits by the Forums catalysed the shift in focus in selected sites. The programme supported pilot initiatives in forest enterprises (e.g. Machinga in Malawi, Mutasa in Zimbabwe, Luangwa in Zambia, fish in Malawi), and promoted discussions of increased community benefits from mineral resources in Zambia and Zimbabwe. Focus on wildlife has also extended to birds in Malawi and Botswana. Cultural and natural heritage has also become an integral part of community-managed landscapes particularly in Botswana and Zimbabwe. The programme supported at least six types of natural resource-based enterprises in various ways. These include joint venture photographic tourism, crafts, veldt products such as honey, medicinal plants, fruits and teas (Botswana, Zimbabwe, Zambia and Namibia), fisheries (Malawi) and forests (Malawi and Zimbabwe). Tourism joint ventures in

Namibia and Botswana have meant a shift from small money from big investors to communities being part owners of lodges in tourism areas (See Annex 11). Other factors such as value creation supported by conservation NGOs and the hunting suspension that affected Botswana, Zambia and to a lesser extent Zimbabwe, in the last year of the programme have significantly given impetus to diversify. The policy shift on hunting is likely to sustain the trend towards non-consumptive tourism and other non-wildlife based CBNRM businesses such as non-timber forest products.

(iv) *Increase in the area under management by communities:* One consequence of enterprise diversification is increase in area and resources under active management by local communities. Although there is no data to verify whether the programme achieved the targeted 3% increase, stocktaking reports in four countries and findings by this evaluation confirm that the area under CBNRM has increased over the last 10 years presumably by above 3% given the evidence gathered under this evaluation. This may not be widespread but certain sites record this impact. MOMS' pilot and roll out sites in four of the participating countries, joint management arrangements in Majete and Liwonde Parks and Machinga Forests in Malawi, honey production forests where communities strictly guard against fires and fishing sites in Lake Chilwa all provide evidence of increased community managed areas. In Namibia, the number of registered conservancies and forests has increased from four in the late 1990s to over 80 to date, and the demand is still increasing.

The programme contributed towards improvement of rural livelihoods. Attribution of the income, ecological and social changes is however partial owing to a general lack of data. This makes PME a priority issue for Forums.

4.2.2 Attainment of the Project purpose

In working towards the purpose the programme intended to see CBNRM principles, policies and practices adopted through facilitating incorporation in national development plans of at least five of six participating partner countries and into at least three other¹³ national sectoral policies (i.e., agriculture, rangeland management and water), in all the six countries. It was also an earlier intention to stimulate investment into natural resources management by CBOs. The extent to which the programme achieved this is as follows:

Box 1: Policy Engagement by the Programme

Botswana	CBNRM Policy (2007) CBNRM Act (pending) Climate Change Policy
Malawi	National Development Plan (2011-2016) Wildlife Policy (Revenue Sharing) Revised Forestry Policy (2013) Fisheries Policy Agriculture (Tobacco levy) National Water Policy Climate Change
Namibia	CBNRM Policy (2013) National Development Plan incorporates CBNRM National Climate Change Policy (2011) National Policy on Coastal Management (2012) National Environmental Law & Policy (2011) HIV & AIDS Policy (2011) Draft Tourism Policy (2010) Concession Flyer Policy (2011)
Zambia	National Development Plan Inputs into the revised Constitution Climate Change Constitutional review
Zimbabwe	National Constitution National Climate Change Strategy and Implementation Plan Agriculture – Forestry Plantation Forestry Mining Policy Climate Change National Tourism Policy

(i) *Adopting CBNRM principles, policies and practices:* The programme contributed to the adoption of CBNRM principles, policies and practices as a mainstream strategy in Southern

¹³ Other than/broader than wildlife, forestry, fisheries and tourism.

Africa. The 2004 study by Brian Jones¹⁴ provided baseline information on the extent to which national governments mainstreamed CBNRM in national development policies. CAMPFIRE (Zimbabwe), ADMADE (Zambia), LIFE (Namibia) and Tchuma Tchato (Mozambique) gave birth to new thoughts about CBNRM as a poverty reduction strategy. However, CBNRM incorporation in national plans was more implied than explicit as heralded in Jones's paper. No country had a standalone CBNRM policy in 2004.

11 years on, all participating countries have more explicitly incorporated CBNRM in national development plans in various ways. In five of six participating partner countries, besides reinforcing CBNRM policy and practice into wildlife, fisheries, forestry and tourism sectors, the programme successfully went beyond sectoral policies to broader national development frameworks (Box 1). Botswana and Namibia now have standalone CBNRM policies adopted in 2007 and 2013 respectively. Botswana is on course to develop a CBNRM Act and to establish the CBNRM Support Association for Botswana (CSABo) under the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. The CBNRM Policy in Botswana plus CSABo were modelled on the Namibian policy and NACSO. Malawi incorporated CBNRM into the 2011-2016 National Development Plan. National Development Plans of Zambia and Namibia also incorporate CBNRM. In Namibia and Zambia CBNRM appears in the fifth and sixth National Development Plans as a direct result of Forum members participating in the planning processes.

This milestone should normally translate into new or increased resource allocation towards CBNRM by Government, the creation of new structures and should help establish a conducive environment for CBNRM. The impact of policy reforms is mixed. Botswana stands out as a first in establishing a CBNRM Directorate in the Ministry responsible for implementing the CBNRM policy. Botswana has deposited sixty five percent (65%) of revenue collected from some CBNRM enterprises into an Environment Fund managed by an independent Board. The fund started allocating funds in 2014 to various stakeholders (not just CBOs) as the fund scope has since increased to include some levies and contributions from other related natural resources management. Malawi is beginning to talk about a tobacco levy, which will see government channel more resources to community based forest management.

(ii) *Incorporating CBNRM into other national sectoral policies:* Since the baseline status recorded by Jones in 2004 there has been new incorporations or discussions of CBNRM principles in more sectors (Box 1). Climate change (all countries), mining (Zimbabwe and Zambia) and Agriculture (Malawi and Zimbabwe) and the water sector (Malawi) are key examples. The community forestry plantations promoted under out-grower schemes by the CBNRM Forum of Zimbabwe is a means of integrating CBNRM into agricultural practices. The Government of Malawi has reviewed the National Water Policy and community participation in water resource management comes out strongly. The Forums contributed to the national REDD+ strategy in Mozambique and National Climate Change Policy and Strategy for Zambia and Zimbabwe. Botswana's Local Government has the position of a Chief Natural Resources Management Officer whose duties include overseeing community natural resources management in local authorities/districts. Zimbabwe's new constitution is elaborate on environmental rights and offers a springboard for CBNRM policy development and the new Minerals Policy incorporates CBNRM principles. These are part of ongoing engagements for Forums. CBNRM Forums in all seven countries (including Tanzania) will continue to be the main force behind continued recognition of CBNRM and its explicit inclusion in current national strategies and subsequent adoption as a practice. There are clear opportunities for incorporating CBNRM in energy, agriculture, water, plantation forestry, disaster management and in the preservation of heritage sites occurring in communal areas. The ET has discussed these in Section 5 under future opportunities.

¹⁴ Jones, B.T.B. (2004). Synthesis of the current status of CBNRM Policy and Legislation in Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Report for WWF SARPO

(iii) *Level of re-investment in Natural resources management by CBNRM CBOs:* CBNRM CBOs have always linked Community investment into CBNRM to perceived or real benefits. A sense of belonging and relevance to national processes further builds on this commitment by CBOs to invest. CBOs are increasingly seeing and sharing a common future and vision with NGOs, Government and development partners and to a limited extent investors regarding investment in NRM. There is evidence that CBNRM CBOs are reinvesting in the management of natural resources activities from benefits derived from CBNRM in all six participating partner countries. The fishing communities along Lake Chilwa, Malawi for example can now pay for the services of police and anti-poaching personnel from the Fisheries Department. USACOL in Malawi is maintaining perimeter fences in Liwonde National Park. In Namibia, conservancies hire scouts for the day-to-day management and patrols. In Botswana, Community Trusts were paying Community Hunting Escort Guides before the hunting ban. In Zimbabwe, 16 Rural District Councils (RDCs) employ 256 resource monitors/rangers in addition to CAMPFIRE coordinators and administration clerks supported by conservation revenue.

4.2.3. Value added to CBNRM principles, approaches and strategies

Apart from the analysis of the impacts as defined in the goal and purpose of the programme, the ET also examined the value the 11-year programme has added to CBNRM principles, approaches and strategies for enhancing natural resource governance in southern Africa. The evaluation can reveal that the programme has:

(i) *Successfully facilitated the process of anchoring and reinforcing CBNRM practice into Government structures.* Whilst this may be debatable as others may argue that Government makes and implements policy, and does not implement practice – it is the view of the ET that it is necessary to commit selected government departments into supporting the implementation of CBNRM tools such as MOMS and performance data collection systems and investing in technology development that supports enterprise growth.

(ii) *Created a community of CBNRM practice at national and regional level:* Practitioners can promote CBNRM through an active community of practice, which is representative of all stakeholders concerned and is open to new ideas. The programme through establishing the regional network has added benefit to CBNRM promotion processes.

(iii) *Initiated mechanisms for measuring and recording the contribution of CBNRM:* Politically, there is need to promote CBNRM as a development option through continuously providing evidence that CBNRM works and can sustainably deliver development solutions. The programme added value by introducing a culture of measurement albeit with limited success due to resource constraints. One challenge, which practitioners may continue to face, is proving the efficacy of CBNRM as a poverty reduction strategy. CBNRM practitioners do not articulate clearly and account for the real contribution that CBNRM can make to national development objectives. Namibia has achieved this fit and has a lot to offer to other countries beyond this programme. Scaling up is also constrained by lack of resources. In addition, changing contexts in the areas targeted for scaling up warrant adaptation which many practitioners and CBOs may not be able to do.

(iv) *Stepped up community participation:* One of the CBNRM principles underscores community participation and their engagement in decision-making. One of the notable achievements of the programme was its ability to draw CBOs into the bigger picture through their active engagement in national Forums and participation in regional exchange initiatives. This was, prior to the programme, less common in most countries with the exception of Namibia.

(v) *Unlocking Funds and Collaborative engagements:* The programme added value by increasing the visibility and appreciation of the work done by CBNRM Forums thereby attracting attention of development partners. The programme therefore unlocked at least 12 funding sources and opportunities for collaborative engagements at national and regional levels which otherwise would have stayed locked in the absence of the programme.

4.2.4. Extent of reach to the targeted group

Although membership base varied from country to country depending on national priorities and existence of potential members, records show that there was extensive engagement of stakeholders in all countries. The programme reached 522 CBOs (Malawi engaging the most); 72 NGOs and 26 Government Department; 47 Donors; 15 academic institutions and 5 private sector partners (Table 3).

The inability of the programme to secure meaningful representation of private sector investors to participate in the Forum, with the exception of Namibia through NACSO membership, was a major weakness of the programme. This is despite the fact that CBOs are involved in joint ventures with private sector e.g. in Botswana's Ngamiland and Zimbabwe's CAMPFIRE and other consumptive and non-consumptive tourism ventures. In the case of this programme, the limited involvement of private sector could be because the programme did not directly support CBNRM enterprise initiatives (such as product development, marketing, technology research). Private sector operators are also involved in other national business associations that are more concerned with improving the investment conditions. CBNRM forums perhaps do not offer the platforms for this type of business engagement. There could be other reasons and this needs further exploration with the aim of looking into successful approaches for Forums to strategically co-ordinate with the private sector. Participation of private sector in national level CBNRM dialogue is and will always remain important especially considering that most CBOs engage in joint business partnerships with private sector. Earlier evaluations identified this issue and it appears all Forums failed to address this. This implies that Forums need to do a lot more work to engage the sector for a joint- partnership in pushing forward the CBNRM agenda. The programme did not effectively engage stakeholders in integrated river basin management, coastal zone management, agriculture and energy. This has implications on the extent to which CBNRM practitioners can incorporate/acknowledge CBNRM as a strategy to address challenges in these sectors. Engagement of these sectors should be an ongoing process beyond this project.

Table 2 Extent of reach of programme (Stakeholder engagement)

Country	Private Sector	NGOs	Government	CBOs	Donors	Academic
Zambia	?	8	5	73	9	4
Botswana	3 ¹⁵	14	7	105	22	8 ¹⁶
Malawi	2	17	5	272	-	5
Namibia	several ¹⁷	14	3	59	6	1
Zimbabwe	1	19	6	13	10	2
Total	6 (+)	72	26	522	47	15

The programme had a lot more indirect beneficiaries beyond this. The general public, students, professionals, development practitioners and communities benefit indirectly from unrestricted online and offline access to Forum publications, manuals and guidelines and the from policy reforms.

The absence of organised coalitions of CBOs compromised effective participation of CBOs. CBOs can be too many and too remotely located for Forums to coordinate them effectively. CBO coalitions are best mechanisms for broad based engagement with community organisations. These, however, turned out to be weak and in need of many resources to establish or to strengthen. Namibia has a well-organised umbrella organisation NACSO which is trying to support a national CBO Association, whilst in Botswana BOCOBONET¹⁸ would have been a

¹⁵ Include wilderness Safaris, Harry Charalambous and Steve Johnson

¹⁶ Include individuals-3 Onalethata Thakadu, Mbaiwa, Magole, Motswetla, Alexander, Mulale, Kaunda

¹⁷ NACSO in Namibia incorporates 24 Tour Operators and 43 trophy hunting companies

¹⁸ BOCOBONET had membership of more than 500 CBOs of which about 100 were CBNRM CBOs.

good coalition to facilitate CBOs engagement. BOCOBONET has had many viability issues that are beyond the capacity of the programme to solve. In other countries national umbrella organisations were absent although there exists a few uncoordinated area-specific CBO associations such as the Upper Shire Association for Conservation of Liwonde National Park (USACOL), Nyika Vwaza Association, Lake Chilwa Bird Hunters Association and Lake Chilwa Fisheries Association in Malawi, Ngamiland Association in Botswana and Honey Producers Associations in various countries. There is need for Forums to support the establishment of CBO coalitions for ease of coordination.

4.3. Efficiency of the Programme

The ET assessed programme efficiency in terms of adequacy of funds and human resources, timeframe, systems and strategies that the Forum employed, partnership arrangements and risk identification and management.

(i) *Adequacy of funds:* The ET concludes that the programme had adequate funds for the planned activities. The programme implemented 90% of planned activities. Surplus and carry over funds for some Forums e.g. Zimbabwe and Mozambique, recorded in several years could be a result of perennial late disbursement of funds. In some countries, it took time to conclude on the annual work plans. This left the affected Forums with no sufficient time remaining in the year to work through all activities resulting in them carrying over funds into the following year. Other respondents explained carry over funds as a result of poor absorption capacity owing to poor planning and reliance on member organizations who had more than the Forum activities to work on.

(ii) *Raising matching funds:* The Forums were able to raise an estimated US\$2.56 million to complement WWF Norway support (Annex 8a). Funds from other sources supported the following activities:- knowledge management mechanism, CBNRM status reports, research papers, production of case studies, publications, training materials, tools, performance monitoring and MOMS. The Forum raised ninety eight percent (98%) of the matching funds in the last two years of the consolidation phase. For every dollar that WWF Norway granted over the 11 years, the Forum was able to raise \$0.21, mainly in the consolidation phase. This is low if one looks at the planned activities in the National Forum Strategic Plans. This presumably could have been more had Forums started concentrating on fundraising in earlier phases, which they did not because they had enough programme funds for operation at the time. It is, however, important to note that these were funds that perhaps would have not been channelled to CBNRM had Forums not been in place. The extent, to which national CBNRM Forums mobilised other resources, is a measure of the organisational capacity development and sustainability. To this end, the ET concludes that the programme made positive impact on capacity of Forums to unlock funding.

(iii) *Value for money:* Given the regional scope of the programme, the range of activities implemented, the range of stakeholders engaged and the multiplier effect (of capacity, training and policy reforms), it is widely agreed that the programme delivered good value for the 11-year investment. The impact has taken effect at various levels and has far-reaching effects to other programmes and countries.

The programme allocated funds appropriately to respond to the priorities identified for each phase. The programme made significant allocations (estimated average 22% of the total annual budget) to Output 1 on strengthening regional and national Forums. This was a key programme output because other activities' success depended on this output. Budget allocations in each phase reflected the exit plan drafted in 2003 of reducing funding to Forums gradually. Recommendations from previous evaluations largely guided budget allocations in each phase e.g. recommendation to narrow down on thematic working groups and to focus on consolidation of best practice appeared in budget allocations. It is the view of the ET that the Forum appropriately aligned budget allocations to programme design and intentions including its exit strategy.

Whether the programme could have achieved same results for less money is doubtful. The cost of training, production of publications, equipment, communication and conferencing in the region is generally high. Less money would have meant a reduction in activity level. Programme funding actually served to attract more funding and less money would ultimately mean less attraction of other funds.

(iv) *Human resources and mobilization of other resources:* The original design had not envisaged assigning staff to coordinate national Forums. Providing support for coordinator positions helped to speed up activities in each country. The programme managed to carry out its work through very lean teams at PMU and in the Forum secretariats. Only the Namibia Forum had extra coordinators overseeing the working groups. The rest of the Forums had one coordinator, who was mostly dependent on the host institution and volunteers for most services such as logistics (transport), financial management and communication. Pressure appeared to mount on coordinators towards the end of the consolidation phase. Coordinators confirmed that they were over-stretched, as they had to attend to ongoing activity demands and imperative sustainability issues.

The programme made effective use of technical resources available through working groups. Most of the professional advice was offered free of charge through working groups, workshop presentations, document editing, implementing MOMs piloting and scaling up. Communities also contributed significantly to the programme especially those involved in piloting the MOMs (monitors, CBO committees). The Forum hired appropriate consultancy services only where there was need. The Zimbabwe Forum estimated the value of in kind contribution from members to be 70% equivalent of the support provided by the programme. Working groups were an efficient way to leverage local technical, financial and human resources. The programme, however, largely failed to nurture ownership and self-drive in two of the important TWGs namely (Training and CBE/CBO) both at national and regional levels. This will weaken the community of practice.

The MOMS/PME and the Policy Advocacy Working Group performed relatively better than the Training and CBE/CBO Working Groups. By the end of the programme, the Policy WGs in most countries had transformed from simple voiceless agencies to strong forces that could even take issues to the Head of State, challenge multinational companies, make presentations in parliament and consider legal recourse. Such was the case in all participating countries.

(v) *Processes and systems for project management:* Financial and activity planning, reporting and review systems and other processes for managing the programme were appropriately designed, continuously improved throughout the project period and were generally adhered to. The programme seriously considered recommendations from external evaluations. Regular communication between coordinators, exchange of reports, feedback and regular country visits occurred throughout the programme period. The PMU introduced Forum self-assessment systems as an extra measure to track progress in capacity development.

There was noticeable effort towards harmonizing the systems of reporting between all levels. Adjustments to budget approval and disbursement processes between WWF Zimbabwe/Zambia and Norway in the first two phases of the programme served to improve turnaround time. This improved timeframe between request and receipt of funds by the PMU. However, delayed disbursements of funds between the PMU and Forums appeared to be a perennial problem to at least four Forums namely Mozambique, Botswana, Malawi and Zimbabwe. The programme experienced delays in finalizing agreements with Forums, the PMU took too long to review drafts and work plans, and Forums took too long to respond.

(vi) *Programme Timeframe:* The ET found that 11 years was long enough to achieve the intended objectives. Capacity building programmes require a reasonably long-term project to achieve desired results. The flexible arrangement that allowed a two-year extension of the Consolidation Phase gave adequate time to Forums to formalize and pursue sustainability

initiatives. It is apparent that the programme failed to take advantage of the long period to start and conclude the institutionalization process of SACF. The Regional Steering Committee and the PMU should have formalized SACF at the end of the Implementation Phase affording itself good time to operate independently whilst enjoying incubation, brooding and hand holding by WWF-ROA in the last few years of the Consolidation Phase.

(vii) *Partnership Arrangements:* Individual Forums variously engaged in partnerships at national level. Common partnerships were for the purposes of implementing MOMs. Of note was the partnership with wildlife, forests and fisheries government departments in all countries in piloting and rolling out MOMs. Botswana and Zambia collaborated with Southern African Science Service Centre for Climate Change and Livelihoods (SASSCAL) for MOMS support and roll out. Malawi collaborated with Leadership for Environment and Development- Southern and Eastern Africa (LEAD SEA) in supporting MOMS and Climate Change. Zambia is implementing a Community Climate Change Adaptation Project with Oxfam. Training institutions emerged as effective agents for institutionalizing CBNRM.

At regional level, after Namibia's USAID funded COPASSA, there have been no major collaborative arrangements formalized to complement the programme. Earlier efforts to engage with SADC in the inception phase stalled when SADC restructured and centralized. It was also apparent since then that being a civil society dominated Forum, securing approval for a formal relationship with a government SADC Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources (SADC FANR) would be, though possible, a mammoth task. At the time of reporting, WWF-ROA had secured formal engagement through an MOU with SADC while the Forum developed links at programme level. Alignment to the SADC NGO coalition and engaging with mainstream, SADC seems to be a clear way to go. There is still scope for renewing negotiations with SADC structures (state and non-state) once SACF is registered.

Dialogue with the Resilience in the Limpopo Basin (RESILIM)¹⁹ Programme, SADC Trans-frontier Conservation Area (TFCA) Unit, SADC FANR, SADC NGO Forum have not yielded much apart from mutual expressions of interest to collaborate and invitations to meetings. Once SACF is registered, the efforts should not be retired but propelled in the same and other directions. Other opportunities to explore include COMESA Climate Change Programme, COMESA's Agriculture Investment Programme, and Integrated River Basin Management; the Southern Africa Development Community Regional Environmental Education Program (SADC REEP), regional inland and marine fisheries programme and shared watercourses programmes.

(viii) *Assessment of project strategy:* The projects strategy was to ensure multiplier impact through replication and transfer of knowledge and skills; policy influence to improve enabling environment; and demonstration sites for dissemination of best practice. This approach generally worked well on all fronts. The programme funded appropriate activities (policy development, curriculum, training, documentation and dissemination) whose outcomes had a high multiplier effect. Sites for best practice were many in the region e.g. MOMS Namibia, Honey - Zambia, Ecotourism – Botswana, policy and institutional arrangements and a range of other revenue sharing systems and these served as sources of learning.

Generally, CBNRM best practice sites continue to be under threat from inconsistent policies that are likely to erode gains of the past 10 years. The strategy suffered from a weakened position and decreased performance of some flagship CBNRM pilots such as CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe. The poor performance of some CBOs originally earmarked to be sources of learning was also a drawback. Reversal in revenue retention policy in Botswana that saw revenue to communities diminish i.e. the reduction in revenue retained by CBOs from 100% to 35% retention and other policy shifts that challenge the core principles of CBNRM was a setback to the momentum that CBNRM had gained through the programme.

¹⁹ USAID-Funded RESILIM operates in Botswana, Mozambique, South Africa and Zimbabwe

The programme strategy and approach also suffered from limited investment towards enterprise support or from limited support towards mobilization of funds for enterprise projects. Although this was not the project's main concern, the issues of poor growth and viability of CBNRM enterprise will always need attention if countries are to adopt CBNRM for poverty reduction. This evaluation recommends that Forums include CBNRM enterprise development support in their resource mobilisation.

(viii) Risks identification and management: The Forum monitored risks and assumptions throughout the programme period and were appropriately flagged or dropped. With the exception of issues identified in the 2012 Consolidation Phase midterm review, most risks remained relevant to the programme. Identified risks, which turned into real threats to the programme, included changes in land tenure and policy shifts already mentioned. Other threats were climate change impacts in all countries; global recession affecting budgets/exchange rates and cost of living (Zimbabwe suffered most); brain drain from Zimbabwe, and the expanding energy sector in many countries, seriously affecting Malawi and Zimbabwe in particular. Some of these compromised the results of this programme.

Although risks were appropriately identified at proposal stage, some of them were not timely detected and sufficiently and timely responded to when they became real threats. For example, forums in Botswana and Zambia failed to see the shifts in hunting²⁰ coming. They also failed to openly and proactively challenge the developments, and to timely plan for their mitigation, or the management of impact. This resulted in reactive responses that led to despondency among CBOs and local authorities in hunting operations. There has been general panic among stakeholders. The lesson from this is that - identifying risks is one thing and seeing the risks coming, planning for their mitigation and managing or dealing with them, is another process that needs to be attended to by committing time, skills and other resources.

4. Effectiveness

The effectiveness of the programme was assessed based on the level of delivery of outputs as set out in the programme log frame (Annex 1) and revised log frame of 2012 (Annex 2). In general, the programme achieved an average effectiveness rating of 2.4 meaning that, according to the Lickert scale in Annex 9, the programme largely achieved the outputs, despite a few shortcomings. This is despite the reduced funding levels during the consolidation phase. Table 3 below presents this evaluation's rating for each output.

Table 3: Achievement rating by output

Output	Achievement Rating	Narrative
Output 1: Institutional Strengthening	3	Only partially achieved, benefits and shortcomings finely balanced
Output 2(a): Practical Tools Application	2	Largely achieved, despite a few shortcomings
Output 2(b): Cross cutting issues (Gender, HIV/AIDS and Climate Change)	4	Very limited achievement, extensive shortcomings
Output 3: Performance Monitoring and Evaluation and Dissemination	3	Only partially achieved, benefits and shortcomings finely balanced
Output 4: Policy Development and Implementation	2	Largely achieved, despite a few shortcomings
Output 5: Conclusion of Support to Select Existing Training Institutions	2	Largely achieved, despite a few shortcomings
Output 6: Programme Management	1	Fully achieved, very few or no shortcomings

²⁰ www.fws.gov/.../ShowNews.cfm and www.africanconservation.org/in.../botswana-bans-hunting-from-2015/ for information on hunting ban

Average/Overall Rating	2.4	
-------------------------------	-----	--

The findings and discussion on each output are discussed below. Details are included in Annex 10.

Output 1: Institutional Strengthening

(i) *National Forums are functional and self-sustaining by 2014:* All countries established national Forums except South Africa. Legal status and effectiveness varied from country to country. The respective national governments recognize all Forums as agents of CBNRM with an approved constitution, a broad membership base and active membership incorporating public sector, CBOs, NGOs, and relevant social, technical, gender and legal expertise. The Forums have strategic plans with activities linked to that plan. Private Sector representation is a weakness of all Forums with the exception of Namibia.

(ii) *The Regional Forum is self-sustaining by December 2014:* The programme has not fully delivered this output, as SACF has not transitioned into an independent entity. There is anticipation that the WWF Zambia Office will host SACF and provide minimal support to SACF and support organizational development and resources mobilization after the project ends.

(iii) *The Regional Forum is independently and actively promoting CBNRM knowledge dissemination and practical application of tools, and facilitating positive changes to policy development and implementation at a regional and international level by December 2014:* The Regional Forum had an active Programme Management Unit. The PMU successfully designed operational work programme at regional level and guided implementation of individual Forums, developed common standards, MOMS, CBE, training guidelines, facilitated production of status reports in collaboration with COPASSA, developed programme reporting formats and self-assessment forms and established a regional website. The PMU also coordinated external reviews, programme audits, exchange visits, regional conferences, and exchange of information and best practice across the region. However, the PME framework (except for the MOMS), the Strategic Plan and the Communication Strategy were not effectively implemented.

Output 2: Consolidating best practices and capacity building in core CBNRM processes

(a) **Practical tools & applications:** The programme produced 17 training modules, manuals and guidelines and different countries adopted these. The programme used modules mostly for informal training. The programme conducted a number of CBO informal training workshops in all the six countries, particularly, on monitoring using the manuals. Colleges and Universities used the CBNRM Guidelines as reference materials at colleges and universities in all the countries; these resources are available on <http://www.sacfnet.org/index.php/resources/manuals>.

(b) **Cross cutting issues thematic areas: including Gender, HIV & AIDS and Climate Change mainstreaming (cross cutting issues):** Despite that in all the countries, HIV & AIDS and gender inequalities have remained important issues, this output was only 25% achieved. While issues of HIV & AIDS and Gender were just as important as any programme component, they were not given due attention. Most reports from Forums were void of gender-disaggregated data. The list of participants in meetings and workshops and Forum membership was the easiest starting point for gender disaggregated data collection. Considerable effort to participate in Climate Change policy forums and partnerships with Climate Change implementing organisations is evident.

Output 3: Performance Monitoring, Evaluation and Dissemination

Rollout of MOMS good practice facilitated in each of the six countries by December 2012: As observed in the mid-term review, The PMU coordinated MOMS and received direct and regular support from technical experts. To this extent, considerable progress was made in piloting and rolling it out in some countries. MOMS attracted significant support from other funding mechanisms (Annex 8). There is need to consider information technology based MOMS for

effective real time, forgery free and paper less system. In this regard, an Ushahidi²¹ system or a modified version could be of use in future CBNRM programmes. The ET has presented the highlights of the successes and challenges of MOMs in Annex 12.

(i) *PME processes established in each country for evaluating CBNRM programme and national performance through ME and reporting results and impacts on the ground:* The regional framework was developed and four out of the six countries (Botswana, Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe) developed their national PME frameworks. Three countries (Botswana, Malawi and Namibia) had started implementing the PME framework. All countries developed CBNRM Status and Stock taking reports between 2010 and 2012. Namibia produces stock taking annually and Botswana is following suit. There is still a long way to go in operationalising PME, infusing MOMS and having the right coordinating capacity for data management. CBNRM needs to have concrete data to prove its worth as a development strategy.

Output 4: Policy development and implementation

Positive policy reforms/development and implementation relating to communities and natural resource management achieved in at least four of the six countries: The level of policy engagement by national Forums was an exceptional achievement of the programme. Forums were involved in policy reviews, development, advocacy and implementation in areas of Climate Change adaptation and mitigation; Constitutional review; Forestry, Wildlife, Energy, Water, Environment, Mining, and CBNRM policies. Because of Forums engagement on policy matters, some national Forums increased their visibility amongst the public including development partners. Botswana and Namibia now have CBNRM policies.

Output 5: Conclude support to select existing partner training institutions

The programme largely achieved this output. Besides building on existing effort in Botswana and other countries, the programme effectively engaged 15 academic institutions in the region.

The process of incorporating CBNRM into curriculum has been long. Other institutions e.g. University of Botswana bemoaned the unclear prospects for employment of CBNRM graduates indicating this has hindered progress in developing and implementing training at diploma and degree levels.

Output 6: Programme Management

It is the view of the ET that the programme had a competent PMU that provided effective and efficient secretariat support to the Regional CBNRM Forum and enabled it and the national forums to achieve Outputs 1-5.

4.5. Sustainability

The potential for the continuation of the impact beyond programme support are high in five of the participating countries. The degrees, however, vary from country to country. Sustainability of Forums depends on three main aspects (i) institutional set up; (ii) financial sustainability; and (iii) sustainability of the activities and impact so far of both the national Forums and SACF. These are discussed below and in Annex 8B.

4.5.1. Institutional set up

(i) *National Forums:* Initially the programme had envisaged that legal registration would deliver robust Forums that would be able to operate independently, have their own bank accounts and vehicles. However, it turned out that country contexts and members preferences largely determined how each country Forum was going to set up. It is important that the programme respected this and adjusted accordingly. The ET has described the institutional set up in each country in section 4.4 above. It is important to note that no Forum that has physically

²¹ *Ushahidi* is a nonprofit, open-source software company that develops a web based platform that makes it easy for people in any part of the world to gather and distribute data.

moved away from its host's location despite being registered. The ET can conclude that, legally or not legally registered, the current institutional set up of Forums in all participating countries guarantees sustainability beyond 2014 at least in the short to medium term (3 years). Continued resource mobilisation, membership drive and sustaining high activity level and impact should be high priority. High activity level needs vibrant working groups. The ET registers concern with the status of the CBE/CBO and the Training Working Groups, which need support so that they are more active.

Institutional setup of SACF: SACF is not yet registered. This is a concern to most stakeholders in the region. Over the 11 years, the PMU hosted by WWF (firstly in Zimbabwe and now in Zambia) acted as a de-facto Secretariat for SACF and successfully coordinated regional level activities under the guidance of the regional steering committee. This has helped immensely to give structure and visibility of "SACF" and to provide a platform to explore and implement sustainability considerations such as registration and fundraising. A transition from the current into a formal regional SACF has come too late to guarantee sustainability at this stage. It is important to note that enough progress has been made to anchor SACF and it is justifiable to anticipate that SACF will be sustainable once it is formalised and perhaps hand held for at least 12 months. There is an active steering committee, vibrant regional MOMS working group, regional best practice guidelines and a regional website to give the SACF a regional image already. SACF is well known and acknowledged in its current state, and this is a good stance. It is important for the Steering Committee to dialogue with WWF ROA for possible minimal support perhaps 12 months to allow SACF to fortify under its new state.

4.5.2. Financial Sustainability

(i) National Forums Financial Sustainability

One of the main concerns of the programme was financial sustainability – ability to fund administrative costs of maintaining the Forum (salaries, rentals, vehicle running costs, communication and other overheads) and ability to finance Forum activities. In the final phase, the programme had a gradual reduction in funding, conducted fundraising training, and encouraged countries to mobilise resources to compensate the reduction in funding by WWF Norway. Most countries positively responded by stepping up fundraising efforts. In four countries, Fundraising Working Groups were established and Zambia and Zimbabwe developed Fund Raising Strategy documents. The efforts yielded positive results as already discussed in previous sections. Annex 8 provides details of the funding sourced by the various Forums in the consolidation phase. Institutional support proposals have not been successful and there is need for Forums to devise innovative ways to raise local funds. National Fundraising Strategies have viable propositions for raising local funds and Forums should pursue them. Zambia was relatively successful with this and could share its experiences and approaches with other Forums.

(ii) SACF regional Financial Sustainability:

The fact that SACF managed to raise funds to support MOMS and to produce publications and document lessons from COPASSA and from other sources other than programme funding is evidence that a SACF agenda is attractive. It is widely believed, however, that its non-legal standing could have compromised its capacity to approach/attract non-WWF related funding partners. However, there is indication that partners may support SACF, once it is registered. WWF has not been committal but there are indications that it could continue to house SACF and meet 10% of the SACF budget. There is also a possibility of some support from initiatives such as RESILIM for regional coordination if the synergies are properly packaged.

4.5.3. Sustainability of the Forum activities and impact

(i) National Forums activity level: The ET is of the view that adequate interventions are in place to sustain the activities of the national Forums and SACF beyond 2014. Six countries have national CBNRM strategic plans, which are being implemented concurrently with the programme activities. The timeframes go beyond 2014, mostly running up to 2016.

(ii) *SACF activity level:* SACF has developed a regional strategic plan. The programme is already implementing some of the activities. As noted earlier regional activities that are already underway are likely to be sustained as long as they remain least cost and do not warrant travel and conferences. The Forum in the meantime should make good use of technology to support its coordination role. The website is already operational and continues to provide information. Keeping the site active requires funding hence the need for continued minimal support to oversee a transition period. Any other additional activity level will rely on resource mobilisation efforts.

4.6. Equity

Beyond training in gender and HIV and AIDS in all countries except Namibia there was no deliberate effort within the Forums or at PMU level to collect disaggregated data to reflect issues of equity. In Namibia 9% of conservancies, chairpersons were females, 49% were female treasurers / financial managers; 29% were female committee members and 25% were female employees²². The programme dealt with issues of rights, ownership, accountability, participation, revenue sharing, CBOs capacity, and performance monitoring, all which lead to greater equity.

4.7 Innovation and Best Practices

The ET identified a number of innovative ways that the programme made. Some of these included establishment of working groups, MOMS, financing mechanisms and others. Details of these are included in Annex 14. A list of some case studies from the region worth learning from are included in Annex 15.

4.8. Replicability of the Programme

Replication of the wider programme to other sites within the seven participating countries, to other countries in East and Southern Africa that have not participated in the programme and to Africa at large, is possible. A Pan African CBNRM up scaling agenda sounds attractive. However, contexts differ and this would require a lot of redesigning. CBNRM principles are highly replicable. Most development initiatives follow the same governance, participation, equity and rights based agenda. Civil Society is naturally the torchbearer of these issues in any sector or country hence this makes the potential for replicating this programme (civil society capacity building) very high.

There is evidence that MOMS is and has been highly replicable across countries and sectors mainly because they are relevant, use simple methods, are needs driven and can be adapted to suit different needs and operational contexts. Introduction of MOMS to the Volunteer Service Organization (VSO) in Malawi has potential of up scaling because of the high mobility of the volunteers. LEAD SEA in Malawi has started training VSOs in MOMS.

CBNRM and mining issues are also highly replicable; Zimbabwe and Zambia have been in the lead of bringing CBNRM arguments into mining. Small-scale mining, prospecting challenges, issuance of mining rights in forest and wildlife rich areas are common across the region and this makes the argument for CBNRM relevant. Conditions for scaling up of CBNRM experiences from this programme are listed in Annex 13.

4.9. Lessons learnt

A number of lessons emerge from implementing this programme.

- a) Forum coordination requires full time input; hence the need for a Forum Coordinator and associated staff.
- b) Host arrangements have a direct effect on the hosted institution.

²²NACSO, 2013 *The State of Community Conservation in Namibia- a review of communal conservancies, community forests and other CBNRRM initiatives (2012 Annual Report)*, NACSO, Windhoek.

- c) Acting in coalitions for advocacy and fund raising requires more effort but increases effectiveness and impact.
- d) Engaging CBO coalitions as members rather than individual CBOs into the CBNRM Forum is the best way to reach out to many CBOs at a least cost to the Forum.
- e) Advocacy work by forums improves visibility, confidence and opens up opportunities for resource mobilisation.
- f) Policy engagement outcomes are unpredictable and many times they take effect beyond the forums but the Forum should adequately document the processes in the form of policy briefs, minutes of meetings and shared with the relevant stakeholders.
- g) The roles and responsibilities of Forums and their partners/CBOS need to be clear as the involvement of Forum Secretariat in direct implementation might jeopardize or compromise their rightful role of coordinating and guiding its members.
- h) Assessing damage in households as part of MOMS data collection brings about expectations for compensation, so there is need for communities to appreciate the reason for MOMS and for MOMS personnel to manage expectations properly.
- i) Once Government agrees to partner civil society, the expectation is that they should support efforts to put in place conducive policies, set aside budgets and allocate enough resources for the implementation of CBNRM policies by Civil Society Organizations and CBOs. However, following what happened in Botswana, where there are strong partnerships with Government yet there have been many policy inconsistencies, this is not a realistic expectation.
- j) Developing bankable proposals requires well-researched data and information, advocacy, networks, exposure (visibility) and charismatic personalities who can provide the needed trust and confidence from development partners.
- k) Successful private sector investors' engagement is all about the financial bottom line. CBNRM needs to guarantee this if it is to attract business partners.
- l) Incorporating curriculum into the formal training systems is not easy – there are strong links to perceptions and opportunities for employment after training particularly at diploma level and above. There is need to ensure that new modules are accompanied by promises of post training benefits.
- m) The “elite capture” phenomenon (where the more advantaged members of the community end up controlling community based enterprises at the expense of the other disadvantaged members of the community) is real e.g. the Baobab (*Malambe*) Juice Case Study in Malawi. To avoid the elite capture phenomenon, both communities, committees and trustees need effective training and accountability mechanisms put in place especially in public, private, community partnerships.
- n) Training focused on committees leaving out the rest of the community, creates classes in communities that leads to mistrust and collapse of CBOs.
- o) The future lies in the youth, the demographics in most Southern African countries show a future demand for land resources and dependency on NR for livelihoods. It is important, therefore, to focus on youths in CBNRM activities. This could mean introducing CBNRM in Wildlife and Environmental Clubs in schools where the youth could learn the principles of CBNRM while still young.
- p) CBNRM has to move from a donor approach to a national collective action. It also needs to be investor driven than donor driven if it is to deliver sustainable economic benefits. Taking CBNRM as an approach and not a programme helps to sustain its practice beyond donor funding, proving itself that it is a sustainable development approach to conservation.
- q) Legal registration of national forums is not a panacea to institutional sustainability. Building onto existing networking structures such as that provided by CURE helps to avoid duplication and build on existing capacities.
- r) Thematic Working Groups provide a rich source of human and technical capacity for national Forums. Their continued existence depends on the value Forums deliver to the individual members.

4.10. Implementation Issues and Challenges

Implementation of the programme faced a number of challenges, which to a certain extent compromised the quality of the output and impact, refer to Annex 16 for details. These include:

- (i) The worst risks/fears and assumptions became reality – e.g. Policy shift in Zambia, Botswana and Zimbabwe on hunting will certainly see a shift into other forms of CBNRM business.
- (ii) Agrarian and mining reforms: Forest areas are under pressure from high wood energy demand (all countries), agriculture, and small and large-scale mining expansion (Zambia, Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Malawi) and the expansion of tobacco farming (Malawi and Zimbabwe).
- (iii) High staff turnover: High staff turnover especially among Government staff assigned to the Forums was common in most countries.
- (iv) Managing expectations: Some CBOs and NGOs expected financial reward each time they participated in any Forum activity. They also expected to access financial support to capitalize their CBNRM enterprises.
- (v) Governance and management issues including the absence of a provision in the budget for full time coordinators, funding and reporting delays, weak partners, high staff turn-over in Government, inconsistent participation of Government and inconsistencies in national governance and policy processes such as land reform, hunting ban, ivory import ban, mining in protected areas to mention a few.
- (vi) Implementation and technical Issues such as limited private sector involvement, failure of some working groups, meetings becoming talk shows and not learning opportunities as planned, inadequate materials and equipment for some activities such as MOMS and limited progress on CBNRM Status Report.

5.0 FUTURE OPPORTUNITIES FOR CBNRM

The evaluation sought to establish stakeholder opinion on the continued relevance of CBNRM, whether it was still a viable proposition as a development approach and the extent to which experiences from this programme could inform the future direction of CBNRM. Many practitioners within and outside the programme strongly believe CBNRM has been, and will continue to be relevant in addressing future development issues. Insights into the future prospects and opportunities for CBNRM focusing on how new developments solutions can build on CBNRM include the following:

(i) *Current issues that CBNRM practitioners need to keep in focus:* The rights based approach adopted by CBNRM and many other development initiatives is one aspect to keep in focus. Governments and policies change from time to time and some changes in the political landscape may diminish opportunities to implement rights based approaches. CBNRM Forums need to keep checking on this. Creating an enabling environment for CBNRM is, therefore, an ongoing process. Specific aspects to keep on the table include:

- *Governance issues (tenure, equity, inclusiveness, participation etc.)*
- *The policy environment for CBNRM*
- *Devolution*
- *Documenting and disseminating best practice and research*
- *CBNRM enterprise development (capital, technology and markets).*

(ii) *CBNRM with less Sport / Trophy hunting:* Sport or trophy hunting has always been topical and subject to huge international pressure. Its permanent suspension may be inevitable and practitioners need to start thinking seriously about a future CBNRM with less or without hunting. Trophy or sport hunting suspension removes one of the critical tools from the CBNRM basket of tools. However, governments should keep hunting as an option where it is viable in line with sustainable use principles, to underscore the point that good CBNRM can help make hunting viable. There is also need to invest in other CBNRM enterprise alternatives that are viable and this will require some serious economic valuation studies. At the same time, the

CBNRM community needs to counter the anti-sustainable use campaigns proactively using sustainable use principles provided for by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). CBNRM practitioners could also use concrete examples from this evaluation for example that show that diversity of use and revenue streams including consumptive use is benefiting the natural resources/ecosystems and the key species of external preservationist concerns. The Forum should see CBNRM in a broader sense. It has potential to contribute to multiple development objectives, including climate change adaptation and mitigation, food security, economic development, and democracy, conflict and humanitarian assistance. It sounds reasonable to talk of thematic expansion (into other sectors).

(iii) *Incorporating CBNRM in Climate Change*: Many opportunities exist under climate change that the Forum can harness to continue to build on the work of the programme. Firstly, design mechanisms to tackle climate change such as Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD+) to implement activities at local level to address deforestation. REDD+ pilot interventions so far have largely failed to meet the financial expectations of communities from the carbon market. Much of what is benefiting communities in REDD+ pilot areas in the short term are benefits coming through quick win livelihoods initiatives or CBNRM Enterprises such as honey production. This opens a window for CBNRM to prove itself that it can deliver incentives to locals and contribute short and long term benefits and hence success for REDD+.

Second, CBNRM from its long years of experience has facilitated the establishment of strong organised community infrastructure e.g. CBOs, Village or District Natural Resources Committees etc, on which REDD+ can build without incurring community mobilisation costs.

Third, monitoring, reporting and verification is a key success factor under REDD+. CBNRM can provide experience and data from MOMS. Fourth, evaluation of the Tanzania REDD+ pilot project reveals that REDD+ faces similar challenges relating to governance, policy reform and institutional capacity issues to which CBNRM can provide possible solutions. There is scope for CBNRM to access REDD+ funding. Various CBNRM Forums have engaged in Climate Change and REDD+ dialogue and policy development in their countries. Whilst an outward facing strategy is important, i.e. mainstreaming/integrating CBNRM into climate change programmes, Forums should adopt an inward facing strategy i.e. one that seeks to re-design CBNRM programmes so that they respond to climate change challenges or mainstream/integrating climate change into CBNRM. There is also scope for an exercise of “climate proofing” existing in CBNRM initiatives.

(iv) *Climate Change Disaster Risk Reduction (mitigation and management)*: CBNRM is moving from conventional approaches to development (and adaptation to climate variability including disaster risk reduction) and ‘transformative development’ approaches that empower local people and support bottom-up, participatory, flexible decision-making and planning processes within a strong institutional context. In addition to the emphasis placed on the ecosystems approach, CBNRM practice has a clear contribution to make.

(v) *Payment for Ecosystems Services*: The concept of Payment for Ecosystems Services (which also includes REDD) is taking center stage. The market based approach to conservation shares similar principles with CBNRM, except that the former uses negotiated payments schemes. The principle of PES is to address what CBNRM seeks to address - issues of collective responsibility over natural resources management. PES has potential to build on CBNRM previous experiences and can benefit from CBNRM application in PES in the water, energy and agriculture sectors.

(vi) *CBNRM and international environment conventions (UNCCD, UNFCCC, CBD and RAMSAR)*. The Forum acknowledged in the programme design that CBNRM can also contribute to global goals of biodiversity conservation, reducing desertification, preserving heritage sites and conserving wetlands. Maintaining intact landscapes and providing incentives to invest in conservation through CBNRM has far reaching impact on achieving these global goals. Although there are no specific provisions on CBNRM in these conventions, national action plans and

policies developed to domesticate these offer an opportunity for CBNRM practitioners to flag CBNRM.

CBNRM in Agriculture: The pressing need to address food security issues in a sustainable manner for resilient communities is increasing the role of CBNRM. Where agriculture seems to provide better options and less opportunity costs, Conservation Agriculture (CA) has been promoted borrowing from CBNRM practice. The World Bank, FAO and other agencies are promoting the concept of Climate Smart Agriculture as a new concept for food security, which seeks to increase sustainable food production and environmental benefits. CBNRM approaches in soil and tree management is appropriate in making food security climate smart and more resilient livelihoods. In Botswana, SAREP under USAID has done tremendously well in Ngamiland District, and Total Land Care (TLC) funded by USAID²³ is implementing similar programmes in Malawi and some parts of Mozambique.

Other opportunities for building on CBNRM in agriculture exist in the NEPAD and COMESA's Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Program (CAADP) promoted in Africa. One of the pillars of CAADP emphasises on sustainable land management and hence CBNRM.

(vii) *CBNRM and Rights Based Approaches:* The increased debate on rights based approaches to human welfare globally is the best basis to advocate for introduction, implementation, scaling up and consolidation of the CBNRM approach. CBNRM provides opportunities for local communities to exercise their full rights to participate meaningfully in the management and development of their natural resources and benefit from them.

(viii) *CBNRM and Green Economy Initiatives:* A green economy presupposes sustainable use of natural resources and conservation of ecosystems as key. It recognises the role of local communities in management of natural resources upon which most greening initiatives are based. CBNRM and related enterprises is well placed as a tool to pioneer and deliver a green economy having considerable conservation and poverty reduction impact in communal areas. Most countries in the region have begun to pursue greening initiatives and this presents opportunities for introducing CBNRM to more private sector investors.

(ix) *Opportunities for Extending the Geographical scope of CBNRM:* In terms of geographical expansion, the programme had focused on Southern Africa. It needs to move on to other regions. However, CBNRM practitioners need to manage any geographical expansion carefully. In case geographical expansion happens, the following areas could be of interest in the interim:-

- a) Angola has great potential particularly in the South East where it shares the Caprivi Strip with Botswana, Zambia and Namibia. Angola's institutional capacity is, however, weak particularly the absence of effective CBNRM institutions and policies. Previous experience under COPASSA found it impossible to work without dedicated and focussed support from CBNRM institutions. This means that initial support for CBNRM in Angola should focus on CBNRM policy processes and institutional capacity building.
- b) Kenya has one of the diverse ecosystem resources providing potential in forestry, fisheries and wildlife CBNRM.
- c) Democratic Republic of Congo has its own problems but a lot of potential.
- d) There are opportunities in coastal areas, marine reserves, water resources management, wetlands and fresh water resources that are under threat and there is need to manage these properly.
- e) Other sectors are Energy and Water Resources Management and Community Led Total Sanitation as is the case in Botswana.

²³ USAID, (2013) Stocktaking Field Guide

6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND OVERALL ASSESSMENT

From the analysis, the ET can conclude that the programme largely achieved what it intended to achieve. The 72 million NOK is an effective investment of funds given the geographical scope of the programme and the multiplier effect of capacity enhancement, skills development through training, conducive policy environment and the regional networking platform. The programme has maintained momentum of the other predecessor programmes and upheld the relevance and efficacy of CBNRM. The programme added value to academic excellence and contributed to knowledge generation in the region. The programme has developed capacity and created national multi-stakeholder platform for CBNRM policy advocacy. The project triggered processes in other countries (e.g. Kenya requested WWF to support) and in Tanzania, the Tanzania Natural Resources Forum (TNRFF) was formally endorsed to serve as the CBNRM Forum as a result of engagement with this programme. Rolling out MOMS, and implementing PME, engaging private sector and regional partnerships are areas of limited achievement. The specific achievements of the programme include:

- 1) Improving conditions for increased revenue flows to households because of the contribution the programme has made to improving revenue sharing mechanisms.
- 2) Increase in the number and diversification of CBNRM enterprises in at least six sites that benefited from direct support of the programme. This has been associated with increase in active sustainable utilisation and management of resources in these sites.
- 3) National Governments have incorporated CBNRM principles, policies and practices in broader national development frameworks in addition to reinforcing the principles in wildlife, fisheries, forestry and tourism sectors in five countries. Two countries now have stand-alone CBNRM policies. CBNRM has also been incorporated in other areas such as climate change (all countries), mining (Zimbabwe and Zambia), agriculture (tobacco farming) (Malawi and Zimbabwe), community forestry plantations in Zimbabwe and national Water Policy in Malawi.
- 4) CBNRM CBOs are reinvesting in the management of natural resources activities from benefits derived from CBNRM in all six participating countries. CBOs are paying for services such as anti-poaching, escorting hunts, fence repairs and fire management.
- 5) The programme created national structures in six countries that will form a community of CBNRM practice at national level made up of at least 522 CBOs, 72 NGOs and 26 Government Departments; 47 Donors; 15 academic institutions and 72 private sector partners.
- 6) The programme stimulated similar developments in Tanzania and Kenya without directly supporting them.
- 7) The programme has been able to draw CBOs into the bigger picture through their active engagement in national Forums and participation in regional exchange initiatives.
- 8) The programme established a networking platform: Put in place a regional networking and information platform that never existed before at regional level.
- 9) The programme established a collection of 27 guidelines and manuals, nine developed by the Forum, that are openly accessed electronically.
- 10) The programme initiated mechanisms for measuring, recording and taking stock of the status and contribution of CBNRM that resulted in the production of the first set of close to standardised CBNRM profiling publications.
- 11) The programme unlocked more funding resources: At least 13 funding sources were unlocked because of the positive image and potential impact of the programme.

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The ET proposes the following recommendations for the Forums, SACF and WWF:

Forums should:

- a) Maintain a strong Secretariat in Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique and Zimbabwe, which can develop bankable proposals and diversify their funding sources, and where possible reduce donor dependency and pursue self-financing of conservation activities.
- b) Self-financing can be achieved if Forums conduct fundraising activities such as producing and selling T-Shirts, tree and plant nursery, mugs, tourist guides, maps and books on wildlife, veldt products, calendars and other natural products.
- c) Organize and activate CBOs and CSOs for implementation of CBNRM programmes on the ground, especially in Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe; be innovative enough to engage governments and other donor partners to support CBNRM initiatives;
- d) Look into ways of sustaining some of the critical monitoring activities such as MOMS, PME and producing CBNRM status reports in Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe.
- e) Seriously consider investing in CBNRM enterprise development support in all countries. The need to strengthen the non-wildlife businesses of CBNRM cannot be over emphasised and this will require conducting a proper economic valuation.
- f) Support the establishment of national or regional CBNRM CBO Associations for better coordination.
- g) Organise end of programme documentation workshop for each country to capture some of these experiences.
- h) Hire at least two people, one to oversee coordination and the other to oversee the technical operations of the Forum – mirror the PMU and the NACSO structure in Namibia.
- i) Engage the private sector more seriously, for joint-partnership in pushing forward the CBNRM agenda and these should be targeted engagements that are specific to their business interests.
- j) Provide back-up services to conservancies and CBOs in areas of CBEs, training, monitoring and governance.
- k) Partner with academic and research institutes for product development and general research to refine CBNRM approaches.

SACF Should:

- a) Expedite the registration of SACF;
- b) Look into ways to enter into an interim arrangement with WWF-ROA until it is able to secure institutional funds.
- c) Keep web presence even in the absence of institutional funds.
- d) Retain at least one person with multiple skills to be able to fundraise, coordinate, update forums and manage the SACF website.
- e) Pursue dialogue with RESLIM and TFCA initiatives and conclude before December 2014 targeting securing support towards keeping SACF functional.
- f) Align and link itself to SADC protocols and programmes, TFCAs, and other regional programmes to justify funding for CBNRM;
- g) Not lose the image of SACF as a CBNRM powerhouse. There is need to immediately raise funds to produce a publication on experiences from this programme – a call for papers, partnership with academic institutions to produce publications etc.
- h) Be strategic by demanding matching funds from implementing partners, right from the start. Matching funds could innovatively be used to capitalize future investments in conservation beyond the funding phase.

WWF ROA should:

- a) Consider to continue hosting the SACF at minimum support costs to enable it to fortify in its new structure at least for a year.

- b) Continue technical support towards MOMS piloting and replication. The regional working group, therefore, needs to be kept active and the individual MOMS champions in each country should be mandated to monitor and provide feedback to experts in Namibia.
- a) Engage in integrated river basin management, marine fisheries, marine and coastal zone management, and sustainable agriculture and energy sectors

ANNEXES TO THE EVALUATION REPORT

Annex 1: Original Log Frame 2003

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	INDICATORS	EXTERNAL FACTORS/ASSUMPTIONS
<p>Goal (Development Objective) Contributing to poverty alleviation and sustainable livelihoods at rural household level from management of natural resources by communities in Southern Africa</p>	<p>Indicators for Goal: Five Years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annual pro-rated household benefits generated by participating CBOs in the target CBNRM areas increase between 20% - 50% in half or more of all participating CBOs in at least 5 of the 7 participating countries - Number, types and resource bases of CBNRM enterprises diversified in at least 50% of participating CBOs in at least 5 of the 7 participating countries as compared to year 1 after project start <p>Within Ten Years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annual pro-rated household benefits generated by participating CBOs in the target CBNRM areas increase between 50% - 75% in 75% or more of all participating CBOs in at least 5 of the 7 participating countries; - Number, types and resource bases of CBNRM enterprises diversified in at least 70% of participating CBOs in all participating countries; - CBNRM Programmes in 5 of 7 participating countries commence development of second generation enterprises (non-natural resource base) 	<p>External Factors/Assumptions to reach Goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Peace and security - Favourable climate - Effect of natural disasters is marginal - Sufficient market demand for NRM products - Absence of boycotts of or moratorium on NRM products (e.g. ivory sale, hunting ban etc.) - Negative impact of population growth can be controlled - Devastating effects of HIV/AIDS can be halted and reversed and others are successful in their efforts
<p>Purpose (Immediate Objective) CBNRM adopted as a mainstream strategy for rural development in Southern Africa</p>	<p>Indicators for Purpose: Five Years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Governments of the five of the seven participating countries fund dedicated CBNRM support institutions (Govt. and NGO); - CBNRM incorporated in National Development Plans of at least five of seven participating partner countries; - CBNRM CBOs are recognized by broader government ministries as stakeholders in local and regional integrated planning activities or relevant national level policy discussions in at least 5 of 7 participating partner countries. <p>Ten Years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All participating governments fund formal CBNRM support institutions; - Formal CBNRM policies/legislation present in all participating partner countries; - CBNRM incorporated in National Development Plans of all participating countries - CBNRM CBOs are recognized by broader government ministries as stakeholder in local and regional integrated planning activities or relevant national level policy discussions in all participating countries. 	<p>External Factors/Assumptions to reach Purpose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Political will to empower communities continues to remain in place - Market distortions by competing sector subsidies remains limited - National Governments remain committed to decentralisation

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	INDICATORS	EXTERNAL FACTORS/ASSUMPTIONS
<p>Project Components (Outputs)</p> <p>1. Regional Forum for sharing best practices, information and carrying out peer reviews made operational and establishment/strengthening of Peer Review For a supported at country level</p> <p>2. Appropriate CBNRM training supported in formal and non-formal institutions</p> <p>3. Strategic institutional capacity-building of focal organisations involved in CBNRM in the public, private sectors, civil society and community levels implemented in the partner countries</p>	<p>Indicators for Outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Four new fora and focal organisations established in Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique and South Africa within 18 months of project start, and all seven fora meetings held regularly to review progress of support organisations and selected CBOs against agreed plans and criteria starting in year 2 - Regional Forum meets at least once in the first 18 months to test standards against at least three examples from each country and to modify and agree on guidelines for best practice. - Annual meetings of regional Forum held to assess and discuss improvement of at least 4 projects from each country against guidelines for best practice and a report on status and progress of CBNRM in the region compiled and distributed within two months of the meeting - Within 6 months of project start technical sub-committees established to study and recommend best practice (in NRM, tourism and enterprise development, institutional development, proprietary and legal issues, institutional capacity building, training) and present findings to national and regional fora as and when required - Within 18 months, each project partner country identifies at least one course in a formal institution designed to include CBNRM - Within 18 months, one local institution in each of the partner country is providing informal training to 2 CBOs in NRM, financial admin and organisation. - By year 4, after project start at least 3 institutions (e.g. SAWC, University of Stellenbosch, Polytechnic of Namibia !NARA etc.) offer accredited and certified CBNRM courses at degree, diploma or certificate level. - Within 5 years at least 2 institutions in each of the partner countries is providing informal training to 4 CBOs in NRM, financial management and organisational planning to standards agreed at regional Forum - By year 5, at least five CBNRM courses conducted in each targeted institution - Within 18 months after project start, at least 3 organisations identified in each of following countries: Zambia, Mozambique, Malawi, and South Africa and needs assessment completed and capacity building strategy developed - By the end of year 5, at least 21 organisations (3 in each of the 7 countries) are able to fully support (e.g. Training, Technical and financial advice, conflict resolution and fund raising, advocacy) CBOs to implement CBNRM Programmes and engage in National and 	<p>EXTERNAL FACTORS TO REACH OUTPUTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ability to retain / recruit high level skills in region / projects - Securing funding in the short term and additional donor / funding partners in the medium / long term - Country organisations recognise the incentives to participate - Willingness of training institutions to engage with project - Willingness of CBOs and NGOs to support training activities - Stable partner relations (Gov, NGO, CBO) - Training institutions willing to share course materials - The role of NGOs and civil society organisations continues to be recognised by national governments - Appropriate technical skills available within region to support focal institutions - Negative impact of mortality rates and sickness because of HIV/AIDS and other epidemics remains limited and efforts by other organisations are successful

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	INDICATORS	EXTERNAL FACTORS/ASSUMPTIONS
	Regional Policy fora in each of the partner countries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Favourable/enabling macro and micro socio-economic conditions maintained - Trained/qualified staff can be retained by public sector organisations
<p>4. Policy and legislation support provided at country level to promote and improve implementation of CBNRM with linkage to regional sectoral policies and transboundary initiatives</p> <p>5. Strategic interventions implemented (HIV/AIDS, crosscutting, emerging issues, gender issues etc.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Within 18 months, 5 countries have identified critical areas in existing policies hindering CBNRM implementation and proposals for improvement recommended - At least 3 countries have amended legislation to create / improve environment for CBNRM by year 5 - Country CBNRM policies harmonized with SADC NRM protocols by end of year 8 - All countries in sub-region ratify SADC NRM protocols by year 8 - Sectoral policies revised in 5 countries to clearly articulate CBNRM by year 8 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Within 2 months, Project Coordinator, Project Coordination Unit and Project Board established in selected country; - Within 12 months, Unit functioning effectively, i.e. grant management and disbursement procedures finalised, timely dissemination of information, dealing with problem areas associated with project start-up and team-building; effectively dealing with partner country fora and SADC counterpart organisation and planning strategic interventions. - Additional donor partners identified within 6 months of project start and agreement in principle for co-funding within 10 months - By end of year 2, strategic partnerships with HIV/AIDS and gender awareness campaigns established, and gender-specific CBNRM activities implemented in partner countries - By year 5, sustainable funding source established (endowment-trust fund) for CBNRM activities after phasing out of project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Political will at country level - National Governments interested in transboundary NRM issues - Policy and legislative support for CBNRM is a priority for sub-regional governments - Sectoral policies integrated/ harmonised to support CBNRM (national) and TBNRM (regional) - National Governments remain committed to decentralisation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Co-ordination - Funding provided and maintained at requested level - Issues – partner in place and also willing to form an alliance with the project - Natural Disasters – adequate access to emergency support and capacity to cope with disaster
<p>Project Activities (See separate list)</p>	<p>Costs and Inputs</p>	<p>Assumptions to carry out activities:</p> <p><u>Pre-Conditions to be fulfilled before project start:</u></p> <p>-</p>

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

Annex 2: Revised Log Frame of 2012

Intervention Logic	Objectively verifiable long term impact indicators (qualitative and quantitative)	Assumptions
<p><u>Programme Goal:</u></p> <p>Improved rural livelihoods at the household level attained through sustainable management of natural resources by communities in southern Africa</p>	<p>% increase in aggregated income and benefits from cash income, employment, and in-kind benefits derived from sustainable use of natural resources.</p> <p>Increase in the number and type of natural resources under community management</p> <p>% increase in income accruing to communities from benefit sharing arrangements in wildlife, forestry and fisheries.</p> <p>Area under CBNRM increased by at least 3% in each of the six participating countries</p>	<p>Peace and security continue to prevail</p> <p>Favourable climate and effects of natural disasters marginal</p> <p>Absence of boycotts or moratorium on NRM products (e.g. ivory sale, hunting ban, etc.)</p> <p>Political will to empower communities continues</p> <p>Devastating effects of HIV/AIDS can be more effectively addressed</p>
<p><u>Programme Purpose (target):</u></p> <p>CBNRM principles, policies and practice adopted as a mainstream strategy in southern Africa for sustainable natural resource management in a manner that promotes equitable access to, use and management of natural resources</p>	<p>CBNRM incorporated in national development plans of at least five of six participating partner countries;</p> <p>CBNRM incorporated into at least three other²⁴ national sectoral policies (i.e., agriculture, rangeland management and water), in all of the six countries</p>	<p>National Governments remain committed to decentralisation and devolution</p> <p>Communities allowed to obtain true value from natural resources vs competing with subsidized sectors</p> <p>International anti-use organisations do not unduly influence governments to prevent use of some NRs</p>
<p>Output 1: Institutional strengthening</p>	<p>Six national forums are formally constituted and active by June 2011 (ie. Legal entities, developed strategies, holding meetings)</p> <p>Six national forums are self sustaining by 2013 (ie. Generating 100% of their budgets, independent of the PMU).</p> <p>The Regional Forum is self-sustaining by December 2014.</p> <p>The Regional Forum is independently and actively promoting CBNRM knowledge dissemination and practical application of tools , and facilitating positive changes to policy development and implementation at a regional and international level by December 2014.</p>	<p>National CBNRM Forums continue to function with active membership involvement.</p> <p>Donor interest in funding CBNRM remains high and submitted proposals will be successful.</p> <p>Organizations continue to allow their staff / members to attend and participate in National Forum meetings and activities.</p> <p>Governments do not unduly interfere in, or constrain the operations of the National Forums or their member organizations.</p> <p>Media are willing to support communication and marketing efforts of the National Forums to gain visibility.</p> <p>Expertise to provide technical assistance on grant proposal writing will be readily available.</p> <p>Donor willingness to fund proposals.</p> <p>Institutional arrangements made by unregistered national fora to receive funding through other institutions that are legally constituted.</p> <p>Suitable training facilitator available.</p> <p>Website is readily accessible and operational.</p>

²⁴ Other than/broader than wildlife, forestry, fisheries and tourism.

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

Intervention Logic	Objectively verifiable long term impact indicators (qualitative and quantitative)	Assumptions
		Regional CBNRM Forum continues to function with active membership involvement. Regional Steering Committee membership remains stable throughout duration of the programme
Output 2: Consolidating best practices and capacity building in core CBNRM processes²⁵		
A. Practical tools & applications	<p>At least xx practical tools & applications developed and shared through with CBNRM support providers by December 2014.²⁶</p> <p>At least 10 exchange visits for Regional and National Working Groups on the above tools and applications held (including documenting and sharing of lessons)</p> <p>At least 2 Workshops per module for Regional and National Working Groups carried out by December 2014 (including documenting and sharing of lessons)</p> <p>At least half the number of best practices (listed under 2.3) regionally shared, endorsed, adapted and implemented at country level in at least 5 countries by December 2014</p> <p>At least eight people per country trained in each of the best practice modules developed (field based training) by Dec 2014</p>	<p>National and Regional CBNRM Forums continue to function with active membership involvement and enthusiasm.</p> <p>Technical assistance on Gender, HIV & AIDS, Climate Change mainstreaming and training, as well as training on critical CBNRM modules is readily available.</p> <p>Internet communications at PMU are not interrupted by electricity supply problems so that access to the programme website is not compromised.</p> <p>Governments continue to cooperate and collaborate in facilitating and expediting exchange visits.</p> <p>Partners and stakeholders remain willing to share best practice information.</p> <p>Partner institutions are willing to document and share good practices.</p> <p>Availability of competent facilitators</p>
B. Cross cutting issues thematic areas: including Gender, HIV & AIDS and Climate Change mainstreaming (cross cutting issues)	<p>Gender integrated into CBNRM programme activities in all national forums activities by December 2014.</p> <p>Climate Change integrated into programme activities in all national forums by December 2014.</p> <p>At least 4 of the 7 forums develop functional partnerships with the relevant organisations for gender, HIV/AIDS and CC.²⁷</p>	<p>Availability of competent facilitators.</p> <p>Availability of appropriate candidates to be trained from partner institutions</p> <p>Willingness by participating country governments to share information on climate change</p> <p>Climate change organisations exist in the country and willing to engage with programme</p>

²⁶ (Note for proposed text in the modules: In the following areas):

- MOMS
- CBO Governance – dashboard, management, governance, financial management, benefit distribution
- CBE / JVs / tenders/ marketing / product development / R&D, veldt products, distribution, beneficiation, capitalization, etc.
- Human Wildlife Conflicts (HWC), compensation, mitigation
- Quota setting – utilisation of quotas, mitigation
- Management planning (land use, zoning), scenario planning
- Resource inventory - game counts, forests, biodiversity assessment
- Fisheries management
- Habitat management, e.g., fire management, productivity improvement
- Conservation Agriculture, Agroforestry

²⁷ Cooperation in implementation of activities

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

Intervention Logic	Objectively verifiable long term impact indicators (qualitative and quantitative)	Assumptions
Output 3: Performance Monitoring, Evaluation and Dissemination	<p>Roll-out of MOMS good practice facilitated in each of the six countries by December 2012 (institutionalisation of a MOMS support team, implementation by 50% of CBOs in each country).</p> <p>At least eight best practice demonstration sites per country operating by December 2014.</p> <p>PME processes established in each country for evaluating CBNRM programme and national performance through ME and reporting results and impacts on the ground</p> <p>Documenting impact of CBNRM at a regional level through production of a Regional State of CBNRM Report by December 2012.</p>	<p>National and Regional Forum as well as their respective Working Groups are motivated and willing to collect data on programme performance.</p> <p>Governments willing to share data with programme.</p> <p>National partners and stakeholders demand MOMS as part of management and decision making on natural resources.</p> <p>Communities willing to share data and information with programme.</p> <p>National partners buy in the activity and there is technical assistance to backstop national initiatives.</p>
Output 4 Policy development and implementation	<p>Positive policy reforms / development and implementation relating to communities and natural resource management achieved in at least 4 of the six countries /CBNRM principles incorporated in legal frameworks present in four of the seven countries and the regional²⁸</p> <p>All forums are actively providing input into CBNRM policy development processes²⁹</p>	<p>Key Policy Makers and Policy makers are willing to cooperate and participate in meetings.</p> <p>Countries willing to share information</p> <p>Invited Regional CBNRM Policy Conference participants attend.</p>
Output 5 Conclude support to select existing partner training institutions	<p>CBNRM curricula institutionalised at five colleges by December 2012</p>	<p>Supported colleges are willing to share own annual reports</p> <p>Availability of appropriate candidates to be trained from partner institutions.</p>
Output 6 Programme Management	<p>PMU providing effective and efficient secretariat support to the Regional CBNRM Forum by December 2011, enabling it to achieve Outputs 1-5</p>	<p>Programme is funded and operational by January 2010</p> <p>Availability of qualified and suitable candidates for the vacant positions.</p>

²⁸ Legal frameworks include national constitutions, policies, laws, regional protocols

²⁹ Input can be in the form of policy briefs, workshops for policy makers/parliamentarians, tracking of policy implementation through the PME framework etc.

Annex 3: Terms of Reference for the Evaluation

A. Objectives of the Evaluation Exercise

1. To assess whether funds have been used effectively and efficiently to deliver expected outputs and results;
2. To draw key lessons learned on influencing policy and suggest mechanisms for sharing these lessons
3. To record and share lessons to improve future programme design and management for similar programmes;
4. To document and account to SACF, in-country, regional and other stakeholders for the programme's achievements;
5. To assess institutional arrangements, governance and capacity in national Forums and their readiness for future challenges and autonomy;
6. To enable WWF to evaluate the performance of the project from 2003, making sure the overall portfolio has increased accountability and responsiveness to stakeholders;
7. To assess the level of stakeholder ownership and participation in programme design and implementation, as a critical component of sustainability of the Forums;
8. To enhance WWF's credibility and transparency
9. To assess prospects for the sustainability of SACF as the deliberate sustainability strategy in the post project funding scenario. This should consider the institutional arrangements and governance structures at both national and regional levels.
10. To assess how the programme has promoted the relevance of CBNRM principles and approaches to, and linkages with other sectors particularly non-wildlife models such as community based adaptation, democratisation, forestry and food security.
11. To assess the synergies established with East Africa and the value of promoting Southern African best practice into East African CBNRM and sharing East African experiences with Southern Africa as a learning point for future and broader up-scaling of the programme's outputs and results;
12. To assess the value that the Regional CBNRM Programme has added to CBNRM within Southern Africa and to East Africa and what it could add in future through SACF;
13. To review the general performance of CBNRM in the southern African region and future directions and provide recommendations on the possible next steps for WWF to share lessons from the programme across the Network.

B: Scope and Focus of the Assignment

1. Assess the relevance of project objectives to the national and regional development objectives and priorities, WWF areas of interest and the needs of beneficiaries;
2. Review of the programme concept and design with respect to the clarity of the addressed problems by the project and soundness of the approaches adopted by the project to solve these problems;
3. Study and assess the results and impacts of the project in terms of qualitative and quantitative achievement of the objectives and indicators agreed to at the time of project initiation and work plan;
4. Assessment of the performance of the project in terms of timeliness, quality, quantity and cost effectiveness of the activities undertaken including project procurement: both experts and equipment, training programs, etc;
5. Review of the LFA and the indicators to assess their appropriateness for monitoring the project performance and suggest methods and indicators to monitor post-project impacts;
6. Analyse and evaluate reasons for success, and shortfall if any, in project activities and its implementation;
7. Review the relationship of various stakeholders and partners who are critical for the success of the project and for sustaining the changes the project endeavours to bring;
8. Assess the prospects of the sustainability of the project outcomes and benefits and recommend measures for its further improvement;
9. Record and analyse the lessons learnt from the implementation of the project and recommend strategies to improve future programme design and management as well as related policies
10. Recommend the way forward through definite next steps in institutionalizing and continuing to build on the work of the programme of supporting environmental civil society to champion the development of a rights-based approach through CBNRM.

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

Annex 4: Evaluation Matrix

The following set of questions drawn from the objectives and scope of the evaluation as provided in the TORs will guide the end of programme evaluation.

EVALUATION SCOPE	INDICATORS ³⁰ :	GUIDING QUESTIONS	DATA SOURCES AND METHODS OF COLLECTION
Relevance of the Concept and the Programme	Relatedness/CONNECTEDNESS between DESIGN and stakeholder and sector NEEDS/PRIORITIES	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was the programme relevant to the (i) environment sector; (ii) development and other sectors; (iii) to your organisation and the work that you do; (iv) to the region? 2. What aspects of the design could have been different/could have been designed differently to make the programme more relevant/appropriate? 	Interviews with national Forums, PMU, review of project document and reports, national policy and strategy documents, CBNRM stakeholders mission statements and CBNRM projects
Programme Design and Implementation Approach	Suitability of/or FIT between the DESIGN / APPROACHES and INTENTIONS of the programme and OPERATIONAL CONTEXT	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was the programme appropriately designed to meet its objectives, the needs and priorities of the CBNRM stakeholders, partners and their beneficiaries? 2. Well operational contexts in the region and in each country adequately taken into account during design? 3. How realistic was the goals and objectives and the set targets? 4. Did the project employ suitable approaches for implementation, monitoring and evaluation? (Look at the implementation strategy, institutional framework for implementation for the region and in each country, working groups, technical experts etc.) 5. Identify any unique/innovative/unusual approaches employed by the programme? 	Interviews with national Forums, PMU, Programme Advisory Board, WWF Norway, technical experts and review of programme document, Log frame reports, use targets set in the log frame and country objectives as reflected in National strategies
Programme Effectiveness	INPUTS into the Programme and value for money	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was the budget and available financial resources realistic for the achievement of the intended objectives? 2. Were the funds used as stated? 3. Was the project / programme cost effective? 4. Was enough time allowed for the achievement of the intended objectives? 5. Were there enough staff, of appropriate competency, for the achievement of the intended objectives? 6. What could have been done differently to improve on programme effectiveness? 	Interviews and Review of Budgets and Financial Reports, funds allocation to activities; Staff time commitments and technical skills check and Reports
Programme Efficiency, Delivery of Results	Plans and Implemented ACTIVITIES (main ones only)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Were the activities implemented according to plans? Were the main activities completed? Focus only on major/main activities maybe phase by phase. 2. To what extent has the programme been outworked in scale and scope as originally envisaged? 3. What were the main implementation issues? 	Interviews with national Forums and PMU review Work plans, Log frame, M&E Framework, Interviews, progress Reports, and previous evaluation reports

³⁰ What specific aspects will the evaluation focus on?

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

	Quantity (achieved against set targets) and Quality of RESULTS & OUTPUTS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Were the intended outputs completed? 2. Were outputs of an appropriate technical quality? 3. To what extent has the appeal strategy been outworked in scale and scope as originally envisaged? 4. What factors internal and external influenced the delivery of results and outputs? 	
IMPACT (Objectives Purpose and Goal)	The CHANGE that has happened, ATTRIBUTION to the programme	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the programme achieved the set Objectives, Purpose and Goal? 2. What changes have happened since the programme was initiated, since 2003? What were the intended and unintended impacts (positive and negative)? 3. Are these changes attributable to the programme and to what extent? 4. Are the changes in line with the goal of the programme? 5. What factors, outside the programme catalysed the achievement of the programme goal and purpose? 6. What factors, outside the control of the programme hindered the achievement of the programme? 7. Assess the risks and assumptions made in the project design to see if these were relevant? What major assumptions were overlooked? (This question could also be asked under the programme design). 	Interviews with national Forums, SACF Board, selected stakeholders in other sectors, PMU, review log frame impact indicators at the Goal, Purpose and Objectives levels. Reports and Previous Evaluation reports.
	SUCSESSES & FAILURES	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What were the project's main successes? 2. What did the project fail to do? 3. What factors influenced the successes and failures? 	
Sustainability	Sustainability mechanisms and prospects (i) of the CBNRM programme impacts and (ii) of SACF	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What mechanisms for sustainability were put in place at programme design and during implementation? 2. Were the impacts achieved in the first phase visible throughout the project? How was the impact build up over the 11 years of the project? 3. Are these impacts likely to be sustained? 4. What needs to be put in place to sustain these impacts? Include institutional mechanisms – i.e. policies and structures. 5. What mechanisms are in place to sustain SACF? Chances of sustainability of SACF? 6. What should be put in place to sustain SACF? 	Interviews with national Forums, PMU, SACF Board, Advisory Board, WWF and review of proposal document, log frame, country reports
Programme Value to CBNRM	Value Added to the CBNRM Principles, Policy and Approaches	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What has the region attained before the programme began by 2003? 2. In 2003, how do you have envisaged CBNRM evolving without the programme? 3. What value or enhancement did the programme add to the following CBNRM dimensions? - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Principles o Approaches o Practice o Policy o Knowledge and Skills o Institutions capacities and capabilities 4. What value did the programme add to other sectors? How did the programme 	Interviews with national Forums, PMU, SACF Board, review project documents, CBNRM literature/technical papers. Important to review CBNRM status reports prior to 2003

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

M&E Framework	CBNRM monitoring efficiency	<p>enhance approaches and policies in other sectors?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was the M&E framework appropriately designed and implemented? 2. Were the indicators and targets realistic? (SMART checklist) 3. Were risks and assumptions adequately assessed? 4. Are the indicators used in the programme applicable in future? Can the CBNRM Stakeholders continue to use the same indicators? What new indicators need to be incorporated to monitor the developments of CBNRM in the region? What should we use to assess and evaluate status of CBNRM in the region in future? 5. How can the stakeholders institute a culture of measurement of CBNRM results and strengthen M&E systems at national and regional levels? 	Interviews with national Forums, SACF Board, PMU, Review of project documents and progress reports and M&E Framework
Stakeholder engagement	Stakeholder engagement, Partnerships and ability to sustain impact	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assess the extent and scope of stakeholder engagement at national, regional and international level? 2. Who did the CBNRM programme engage? 3. Describe the quality of relationships established with the programme and between active stakeholders? 4. Which strategic stakeholders were left out by the project? 5. To what extent were stakeholders engaged in design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation? 6. Were relevant partnerships created for implementing the programme? 7. How effective and coherent were these partnerships and how did they add value to the programme? 8. Will these partnerships be relevant in future? 9. What other forms of partnerships could be established in order to sustain and further develop CBNRM in the region? 10. What is the level of ownership of the project? 11. To what extent have regional strategic actors, government power-holders/decision-makers / officials improved their commitment to, and started taking action on, the CBNRM policy issues? 12. To what extent are local communities and media undertaking advocacy actions on CBNRM policy issues? 	Interviews with national Forums, SACF Board, PMU, Review of project documents and reports
Institutional Arrangements	Effectiveness and usefulness of current arrangements for the future including SACF (cross reference sustainability)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How has the project influenced CBNRM institutional arrangements at local, national and regional level? 2. How effective (at all levels) are current institutional arrangements for CBNRM implementation? 3. Will the existing institutional arrangements continue to be relevant, appropriate and effective for the envisaged future development of CBNRM? 	Interviews with national Forums, SACF Board, PMU and review of project documents and reports
Lessons learnt and Best Practice	Lessons learnt and Opportunities for sharing lessons	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What important lessons were learnt from implementing this programme? 2. What best practice can you identify? 3. Were the lessons learnt and best practice timely identified, documented and shared widely across the region? 	Interviews with national Forums, PMU, Programme Advisory Board and review of project documents and

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Did these influence any changes to the programme design and approaches? 5. What new ideas, opportunities emerged as you implemented the CBNRM programme? 6. Are they relevant for future application/replication beyond this programme? 	reports.
Scaling Up	CBNRM programme activities & approaches expansion and replication into new areas	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What opportunities exist for scaling up CBNRM in individual countries and across the region? 2. To what extent can CBNRM achievements influence other sectors and possibly be mainstreamed across other sectors? 3. What factors will facilitate or hinder scaling up? 	Interviews with national Forums, SACF Board, PMU and review of project documents and reports.
Future direction of CBNRM	The future of CBNRM and opportunities for pursuing a rights-based approach through CBNRM	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do you see the future direction/prospects of CBNRM in the region? 2. What new opportunities are emerging for CBNRM in your country and in the region? 3. What synergies have been created with East Africa that could be pursued further? 4. What will be the role of South Africa's CBNRM experiences in supporting further development of CBNRM in the region? 5. What is the potential efficacy of a rights based approach in CBNRM to achieve lasting/sustainable NRM – comment on the existing institutional contexts for implementing effective rights based approaches for CBNRM in your country or region? 	Interviews with national Forums including East Africa and South Africa, SACF Board, PMU, Programme Advisory Board, WWF Norway Technical reports reviews,

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

Annex 5: Work Plan (Time Table / Schedule)

MONTHS		AUGUST				SEPTEMBER				ACTUAL DATES
MAIN PHASES / WEEKS		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1	Preliminary Skype Meeting with PMU									01-Aug-14
2	Inception writing and submission									4th August 2014
3	Preparation, Logistics and Literature Review									4-8 Aug 2014
4	Inception meeting, contracts, logistics in Lusaka									15th August
5	Stakeholder Consultations in Zambia, Daulos									11-18 August
6	Stakeholder Consultations in Malawi, Anne									19-23 August
7	Stakeholder Consultations Namibia, Daulos									25-29 August
8	Stakeholder Consultations in Botswana, Anne									25-29 August
9	Consultants meeting in Jo'burg from Botswana & Namibia									29-Aug-14
10	Consolidation of Preliminary Findings									29 Aug-1 Sept
11	Debriefing of Preliminary Findings to PMU in Johannesburg									1st Sept
12	Skype meetings with Advisory Board Members									29 Aug - 4 Sept
13	Consolidation of Preliminary Findings									23-25 Aug 2014
14	Data entry, analysis and report writing									5-12 Sept 2014
15	Submission of first draft report									15-Sept
16	Review of first draft report by PMU & Stakeholders									15-21 Sept
17	Receive feedback from PMU & Stakeholders									22-Sep-14
18	Incorporate comments and write final report									23-29 Sept 2014
19	Submit final report									30 Sept 2014

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

Annex 6: List of people consulted

Country	Name	Institution Represented	Position in the Forum	Contact Details
BOTSWANA	Felix Monggae	Kalahari Conservation Society	Forum Host/ Secretariat	felixmonggae@kcs.org.bw
	Mr Onkemetse Joseph-Tshole	Kalahari Conservation Society	Forum Coordinator	onkemetse@kcs.org.bw
	Mr Keoagile Bereeleng	Kalahari Conservation Society	Finance and Administrator	keoagileBareelang@kcs.org.bw
	Dr.Kabelo Senyatso	BirdLife Botswana (BLB)	CSO Representative	blb@birdlifebotswana.org.bw
	Mr Thabo Dithebe	Botswana Tourism Organisation	Forum Chairperson	tdithebe@botswanaturism.co.bw
	Mr Rex Mokandla	Department of Wildlife and National Parks	Government MOMS and Training Working Group	rmokandla@gov.bw
	Mr Steve Johnson	Southern African Regional Environment Program (SAREP)	Private Representative	sjohnson@sarep.co.bw
	Dr. K. Mulale	University of Botswana	Training Working Group	mulalek@mopipi.ub.bw
	Mr Rudd Jansen	United Nations Development Programme	Development Partner, Policy	rjansen@gov.bw
	Akel Miston Banda	FANR, Senior Programme Officer, Environment and Sustainable Development	SADC Secretariat, Partner	abanda@sadc.int
	Mr D. Sheibah Letsholo	BOCOBONET	CBO representative	letsholo.letsholo@gmail.com
	Ms Sentsho Malebogo	Department of Wildlife Management and Parks, Research and Statistics	MOMS Working Group	misentsho@gov.bw
	Dineo Keithome	Department of Wildlife Management and Parks, Research and Statistics	MOMS Working Group Chair	
	Dr. O. T. Thakadu	UB-ORI	Ngamiland Forum Chairman, CBO	othakadu@ori.ub.bw
	Steve Horn	USAID	Development Partner	-
	Gladys Siphambe	National Museums and Monuments	Member	Bsiphambe@gmail.com
	Phatsimo Lobelo	American Embassy	Partner	Lobelop@state.gov
	Leban Baleseng	Department of Environment Affairs	Member	lgbaleseng@gov.bw
Mogonye Trust	Mogonye Trust	Chairperson		
Kenya	Dr Taye Teferi	WWF Regional Office of Africa, Nairobi	Advisory Board Member WWF Regional Director	TTeferi@wwfafrika.org
MALAWI	Reginald Mumba	CURE	Forum Coordinator	reginald.mumba@gmail.com
	Chris Mwambene	CURE Executive Director	Executive Director, Host	cmwambene@gmail.com
	Ramosh Jiya	DNPW, Deputy Director	Steering Committee Chairperson	0888834220
	Robert Kafakoma	Training Support for Partners	Chair Policy Working Grp, Steering Committee member	0888842875
	Chris Nyasa	Principal Fisheries Officer	Vice Chair Training Working Group, Steering Committee member	0884403418
	Veriasi Donzani	USACOL Chairman	CBO	0999385189
	Maria Ndalama	USACOL Treasurer	CBO	09990822875
	Patricio Ndezela	Director, African Parks Ltd	Forum Vice Chairperson	patricio@africanparksmw.com
	Sultan Chowe	USACOL	Board of Trustees Chair	
	Blessings Musikuwanga	Liwonde Parks Research Officer	MOMS Working Group	
	Alick Makanjiya	Liwonde Parks Extension Officer	MOMS Working Group	
	Austin Salapata	Lake Chilwa Fisheries Association	MOMS Monitor (Fisheries)	
	Dickson Kamwendo	Chindenga Forest Block	MOMS Monitor (Forestry)	
	Bob Joshua	Department of Fisheries District Fisheries Officer	MOMS WG Fisheries	
	David Chitedze	Greenline Movement Director	MOMS Trainer/Advisor	
	Moses	Forestry Department, A/District Forestry Officer	Working Group Forestry	

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

MALAWI	M Kalongo	Chairperson, Mwakwambalani	MOMS Monitor, Birds	
	Jameston Kamwendo	National Herbarium and Botanical Gardens	Vice Chair, MOMS Working Group	
	Karren Price	MEET Coordinator	Steering Committee member	
	Moffat Kayembe	Mount Mulanje Conservation Trust	Chair, CBE/CBO Working Group	
TANZANIA & MOZAMBIQUE	Geoffrey Mwanjela	WWF Coastal East Africa Global Initiative	Projects Officer	gwanjela@wwafrika.org
	Dr Simon Anstey	WWF Coastal East Africa Global Initiative	Technical Advisor; Advisory Board Member	sanstey@wwafrika.org
NAMIBIA	Maxi Louis	Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organizations (NACSO)	Coordinator	maxi@nacso.org.na
	Patricia Skyer	WWF Namibia	Governance Advisor; Advisory Board Member	pskyer@wwf.na ;
	Annatjic du Preez	NACSO NRWG	Coordinator	annatjicdp@iway.na ;
	Greenwell Matongo	WWF Namibia	Wildlife Utilization Specialist	gmatongo@wwf.na ;
	Karine Nuulimba	IRDNC Namibia	Managing Director	Karine.nuulimba@gmail.com ;
	Greg Stuart-Hill	WWF Namibia	Advisor	gstuart@wwf.na ;
	Josephine Ipinge	Ministry of Environment	Chief Warden	
	Chris Weaver	WWF Namibia	Managing Director	cweaver@wwf.na
SOUTH AFRICA	Clementine Masambo	WWF Namibia	Secretary	reception@wwf.na ;
	Melissa de Kock	WWF Norway, Cape Town	Advisor for CBNRM Climate Change Adaptation	Mdekock@wwf.no
ZAMBIA	Vincent Ziba	CBNRM Forum	Coordinator	vziba@wwfzam.org
	Biston Mbewe	CBNRM Forum	Chairperson	Biston.mbewe@gmail.com
	Juliana Chileshe	Policy Working Group	Board Member	chileshasnofwa@yahoo.com ,
	Robert Chimambo	Policy Working Group	Member	kchimambo@gmail.com ,
	Elizabeth Ndhlovu	Embassy of Finland	Sector Advisor	Elizabeth.ndhlovu@formin.fi ,
	Marja Ojanen	Embassy of Finland	Councillor Natural Resources Mgt	Marja.Ojanen@formin.fi
	Deuteronomy Kasaro	Forestry Department	Deputy Director	deutkas@yahoo.co.uk ,
	Flavian Mupemo	Danish Embassy, Small Projects	Coordinator	fmupemo@yahoo.com ,
	Moosho Imakando	Royal Norwegian Embassy	Senior Programme Officer, Agric Food Security, Environment & Gender	imi@mfa.no emb.lusaka@mfa.no
	Mwape Sicholongo	WWF Zambia	PMU Coordinator	msicholongo@wwafrika.org
	Josephine Chilunda	Luangwa Baobab Association	Treasurer	+260979227537
	Mary Banda	Luangwa Baobab Asso	Chairlady	+260975008025
	Collins Mvula	Luangwa Baobab Asso	Secretary	+260979468866
	Boniface Chifunda	Luangwa Baobab Asso	Member	+260979409235
	Angela Lwanga	WWF Zambia	PMU Projects Assistant	alwanga@wwfzam.org
	Mwaka Kabwe Phiri	WWF Zambia	Financial Analyst	mkphiri@wwfzam.org
	Dr. Nyambe Nyambe	WWF Zambia	Country Director; Advisory Board Member	nnyambe@wwfzam.org
ZIMBABWE	Dr. Cecil Machena	CAMPFIRE Zimbabwe	Coordinator	cmachena@gmail.com
	Muthuso Dhlwayo		Chairman, Advisory Board	
	Lilian Goredema	WWF Zimbabwe	PMU Operations Manager	lgoredema@wwafrika.org

Annex 7: List of documents consulted

Project Documents Received from the PMU

- i. Project Document and Logframe
- ii. Revised Logframes
- iii. Project Financial Reports including Audited Reports
- iv. Technical Progress Reports
- v. External Evaluation Reports of 2005, 2008, 2009 and 2012
- vi. Country Forums Reports
- vii. Feasibility Study of SACF

Other Documents Consulted

CURE (July 2011) *The National CBNRM Forum for Malawi Strategic Plan for 2012-2016*. The Coordination Union for the Rehabilitation of the Environment (CURE), Malawi.

CURE (18 July 2012) *Minutes of the National CBNRM Forum in Malawi, meeting held at Crystal Waters Lodge, Salima 29th June 2012*. The Coordination Union for the Rehabilitation of the Environment (CURE), Malawi.

CURE (August 2012) *Proceedings of workshop on dissemination of CBNRM stocktaking report held at Crystal Waters Lodge, Salima 28th June 2012*. The Coordination Union for the Rehabilitation of the Environment (CURE), Malawi.

CURE (10 Oct 2012) *Report on training of Extension Staff on the Management Oriented Monitoring systems (MOMS) at Sun Village Motel, Liwonde 13 to 14 Sept 2012*. The Coordination Union for the Rehabilitation of the Environment (CURE), Malawi.

CURE (11 Oct 2012) *Report on visits to MOMS sites by MOMS/PME working group as part of the process of consolidating and disseminating MOMS Data*, The Coordination Union for the Rehabilitation of the Environment (CURE), Malawi.

CURE (Dec 2012) *Summary of training for MOMS Monitors held at Mpaweni Lodge, Liwonde and Naming'azi Training Centre, Zomba 29 to 30 November 2012*, CURE and LEAD SEA, Malawi.

CURE (January 2013) *Report on the refresher course for MOMS Monitors held at St. Luke Nursing Training Centre in Zomba, 15 to 17 January 2013*. CURE, Malawi

Jiji, Beauty (Undated) *Impact of CBNRM on Gender, a study of Southern Africa (Botswana, Malawi, Namibia and Zimbabwe)*, WWF ESARPO

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

Kapyepye, Mabvuto (2012) *Strategic Plan for National CBNRM Forum, 2012-2016*, CURE, Blantyre

KCS (undated) Botswana CBNRM Forum Strategic Plan 2011-2012, Karahari Conservation Society, Botswana.

NACSO (March 2011) *Strategic Plan 2011-2015*, NACSO, Windhoek.

NACSO 2013 *Namibia's communal conservancies: a review of progress and challenges in 2011*. NACSO, Windhoek.

NACSO (2013) *The State of community conservation in Namibia- a review of communal conservancies, community forests and other CBNRM initiatives (2012 Annual Report)*. NACSO, Windhoek.

Nyirenda Vincent, R. (August 2010) *Community Based Natural Resource Management Stocktaking Assessment, Zambia Profile*, USAID

Macuacua Joaquim (April 2011); Mozambique CBNRM Country Profile, USAID

Maguranyanga, B. (undated) *An Assessment of SACF's Feasibility, Viability and Sustainability, The Future*

Mauambeta, DDC and Robert PG Kafakoma (October 2010) *Community Based Natural Resources Management: Stocktaking Assessment; Malawi Profile*. USAID

Matakala, Patrick Dr. and Dr Jacob Mwitwa (2009) *Training and Learning Resource Materials for CBNRM Modules for Certificate in Forestry Course at the Zambia Forestry College*, WWF ESARPO

Mazambani, David and Dembetembe (March 2010) *Community Based Natural Resources Management Stocktaking Assessment, Zimbabwe Profile*; USAID

Mbaiwa, Joseph, E Dr (October 2011) *CBNRM Stocktaking in Botswana*, USAID

Ministry of Environment and Tourism (August 2013) *Guidelines for Management of Conservancies and Standard Operating Procedures*, Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Republic of Namibia.

Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) (2012) *Annual Report 2012*

WWF Norway Strategy 2013-2016

WWF Norway Strategy for Support to WWF's Global Priorities 2012-2016

Zambia CBNRM Forum (10 May 2012) *Proposed Kanguwui Large Scale Copper Mining Project By Mwembishi Resources Limited in Lower Zambezi National Park, Luangwa District, Lusaka Province; Letter to Zambia Environmental Authority (ZEMA)*, Zambia CBNRM Forum.

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

Zambia CBNRM; (Undated) *Zambia CBNRM Organizational Profile*. Zambia CBNRM

Zambia CBNRM Forum (undated) Policy Advisory note on the Proposed Kangaluwe Large Scale Copper Mining Project in the Lower Zambezi National Park, Zambia CBNRM Forum

Zambia CBNRM Forum (2014) *2014 First Quarter Report*, Zambia CBNRM Forum

Zambia CBNRM (Undated) *Zambia CBNRM Flyer*.

Zambia CBNRM Forum (2011); *Zambia CBNRM Forum Strategic Plan 2011-2015*; Zambia CBNRM Forum, Lusaka

Zimbabwe National CBNRM Forum (2012) *Strategy Document, 2011-2015*; Zimbabwe National CBNRM Forum

Zulu, Christopher (Dec 2011), *SACF Five Year Strategic Plan 2012-2016*, WWF ESARPO.

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

Annex 8a: List of funds mobilized by various Forums 2013-2014

FORUMS	FUNDS RAISED IN 2013-2014	ANTICIPATED FUNDS 2015-2018	PROJECT	SOURCE	REMARKS
Malawi	US\$45,700	US\$62,500.00 (GEF Small Grants Programme for USACOL up 2015 (18 months)	MOMS Training, CBO capacity building, revising CURE strategic plan by incorporating CBNRM as one of its programmes	LEAD, World Bank, UNDP - GEF Small Grants and Department of National Parks and Malawi Environment Endowment Trust (MEET)	This is the highest amount raised by the Malawi CBNRM Forum from other sources. Previously smaller amounts have been sourced including contributions in kind from Government.
Zimbabwe	US\$ 330 000	0.00	MOMS /PME support, Community Plantations	European Union	The funds were raised as part of a project consortium including other local CSOs, one parastatal and a UN agency.
Zambia	US\$684,000	€254,000.00 US\$10,000 (TIKVA annually) £400,000 (OXFAM)	Community Adaptation Project, Livelihood Support in three Game Management Areas , MOMS development, training and roll out	Oxfam/Government of Scotland, Tikva Foundation, UNDP-SDG, Southern African Science Service Centre for Climate Change (SASCAL	The Civil Society Environmental Fund (CSEF) grant came to an end November 2013 but a second to run from 2014 to 2018 is being awaited. This fund gave the Forum funds for organisational development.
Botswana	US\$271,000		Journalists Training, transport, MOMS development, training and roll out	USAID/Government of Botswana, UNDP, SASCAL	The main proposal submitted for the CBNRM Support Association for Botswana to be funded under the national Conservation Trust Fund (CTF) has been rejected. Of the amount reported, US\$71,000 was raised by the Secretariat but for CBNRM relevant activities (craft development)
Mozambique	US\$140,000	US\$420,000.00 WWF (up to 2017)	1/ "Investments that Work for People, Forests and Land" Dialogue support to CSO Forum/Alliance	SIDA and MFA Finland (via WWF Finland/Sweden)	WWF Moz Country Office for partners programme. The funding was provided through the WWF Coastal East Africa Global Initiative (CEAGI)
Namibia	US\$900,000.00	>US\$1,000,000.00	CBNRM Trust Fund development, Anti-	MCA – Namibia, WWF	The WWF funding will continue beyond 2015. EIF funds were already spent on the Expo;

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

			poaching and operational costs for the secretariat, state of the conservancies report, Tourism Expo for Namibia, forestry activities, assessments, working group support	NAMIBIA , EIF	CBNRM Trust fund to be registered by the end of the year 2014. Members will raise their own funding for activities.
Tanzania	US\$190,000.00	US\$640,000 Up to 2017	1/ "Investments that Work for People, Forests and Land" support to TZ Forum 2/ Land Based Investments Dialogue and research	1/ SIDA and MFA Finland (via WWF Finland/Sweden) 2/ CARE-DENMARK	1/ WWF TZ Country Office for partners programme. The funding was provided through by the WWF Coastal East Africa Global Initiative (CEAGI) 2/ CARE-DENMARK – DANIDA funding support re issues of land based investments ('land grabs') and local tenure, land/NR management - CBNRM
TOTAL	US\$2,560,700.00				

Sources: Mwape Sicholongo, CBNRM TPR, Final Report 2013-2014 and Country CBNRM Forums

Annex 8b: Sustainability of the Forum

The potential for the continuation of the impact beyond programme support are high in five of the participating countries. The degrees, however, vary from country to country. Sustainability of Forums depends on three main aspects (i) financial sustainability; (ii) sustainability of the activities and impact so far of both the national Forums and SACF and (iii) institutional set up; and (iii). These are discussed below.

Financial sustainability

Six countries raised a total of US\$2,560,700.00 for activities that go beyond 2015 in most countries (See Figure 1). More details are included in Annex 8. Most of the funds, however, go towards Forum activities and not administrative costs – which raises a few concerns. The general outlook on financial sustainability initiatives is as follows:-

- (1) Botswana has developed a fundraising strategy in 2014; and raised US\$271,000.00
- (2) CURE (Malawi) has raised funds for its strategic planning; and raised US\$45,700.00
- (3) Mozambique will receive substantial institutional support from WWF/SIDA/MFA Finland initiative that has already met the Forum's institutional expenses in the last year; at the rate of US\$140,000.00 per annum;
- (4) Namibia's Millennium Challenge Account, WWF Namibia and Environment Investment Fund will meet some of NACSO's secretariat costs. Namibia raised US\$900,000.00 in the year 2013-2014.
- (5) WWF/SIDA/MFA Finland/TNRF is supporting the Tanzania Forum for US\$190,000 per annum for the next three years
- (6) Zambia has also attracted limited funding to the tune of US\$684,000.00 and has devised innovative cost recovery mechanisms to raise funds to buy a vehicle and levy members for services rendered;
- (7) Zimbabwe raised US\$330,000.00 and intends to start commercial beekeeping enterprise as part of its fundraising strategy.

Institutional sustainability

Sustainability of SACF

Support from existing initiatives is not likely to be substantive or long-term commitments though, hence the need for the PMU to look for new separate funding. SACF could provide a clearinghouse mechanism for regional initiative such as TFCAs and position itself to coordinate regional communities of practice in specific CBNRM technical themes such as what was happening for MOMs. The PMU should improve engagement with donors at the forth-coming end of programme workshop by way of show casing its successes. There is need to continue to influence positive opinion about CBNRM and perhaps repackage it and enhance its scope of the areas it can influence. Vibrant personalities will have to continue managing SACF's Secretariat who see beyond what is obvious.

Once registered, SACF could also generate funding by broadening its funding sources beyond WWF Norway and NORAD as follows:

- 1) Contributions from individual Forums,
- 2) Forge strong linkages to other regional bodies such as SADC, the East African Community and other economic regional bodies;
- 3) Forge linkages to foundations dealing with other activities / sources of support beyond traditional CBNRM - Climate change, forestry, REDD+, Carbon trading, mining etc.
- 4) Coordinating access by CBNRM experts to regional consultancy service provision opportunities

Sustainability of Forums

There is need for personnel to implement these activities after 2014. It is likely that all Forums will have at least the secretariats to oversee implementation. Thematic working groups, as discussed earlier, are a

critical component for sustaining Forums activity levels. Namibia already has personnel working within NACSO overseeing special interest areas. Mozambique will benefit from the civil society consultations and is likely to see working groups functioning. Botswana has a window of opportunity following the commitment by Government to establish CSABO. The Botswana Forum needs to convince the incoming Ministry's CBNRM Coordinator (raised to the level of a Directorate) to set up special interest technical areas which can serve as coordinating desks for special interest groups and taking up the role of coordinating TWGs. Other countries need to invest time and funds to keep these groups functional.

The Forums have identified a number of issues that need lobbying and advocacy. This includes the anti-hunting related bans and suspensions (Zambia, Zimbabwe and Botswana) discussed earlier; mining (Zambia and Zimbabwe); concluding the institutional mechanisms for implementing the CBNRM policy in Botswana, replicating revenue sharing mechanisms and many others. Because stakeholders recognise all forums as the voice for advocacy, there will continue to be a push for Forums to act. This push will most likely sustain activity levels in the forums.

Institutional set up

a) National Forums

Initially the programme had envisaged that legal registration would deliver robust Forums that would be able to operate independently, have their own bank accounts and vehicles. However, it turned out that country contexts and members preferences largely determined how each country Forum was going to set up. It is important that the programme respected this and adjusted accordingly. The ET has described the institutional set up in each country in section 4.4 above. Under Output 1, the ET established that members of the Forums in all the countries had confidence in their choice of institutional set up. Directors of KCS and CURE believe there is mutual benefit to the two existing together. The ET had mixed opinion on the relationship between legal status and forum sustainability. The legally registered Forums (Zimbabwe and Zambia) are likely to sustain better and become visible as long as they are able to fundraise, sustain a certain activity level and drive membership growth. Whilst Forums hosted by KCS (Botswana) and CURE (Malawi) are to benefit from current and previous successes of their host, their pace will largely be determined by that of the host institution. They will continue to operate as programmes within their host institutions and rely heavily on the integrity and growth of the host. However, the ET expect issues of conflict of interest and constrained visibility.

There is little doubt, however, that the Forums in Malawi and Botswana will continue to exist and grow in their scope of influence and membership. The NGOs that are hosting them are strong and have good reputation. CURE in Malawi is committed to incorporating CBNRM as a focal area in its next strategic plan and they have already approved funding for the next strategic planning. The concern though of the members in Malawi and Botswana is the capacity of CURE and KCS to raise funds for their core business so that they continue to exist and that there is a conscious "separation of roles" between the Forum and the host. In Botswana, KCS and members are already on course to lobby Government to finalise the establishment of CSABO within the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. This development will address some of the concerns. On the other end, the independently registered forums - Zambia and Zimbabwe - may struggle to retain members if they fail to deliver value to members. These forums will not enjoy the benefit of association with a well-known host to attract members. Strong membership drive, though important to all Forums, is particularly important to these two Forums.

It is important to note that no Forum that has physically moved away from its host's location despite being registered. CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe, and WWF in Zambia have continued to host national Forums despite that Forums are legally registered. This has remained so for different reasons – there are location advantages and Forums have not raised enough institutional funding to enable them to move away. Indications are Zambia Forum and NACSO may move offices. NACSO will be occupying the offices at WWF Namibia Offices where the rest of the NACSO Working Group staff have offices.

The ET can conclude that, legally or not legally registered, the current institutional set up of Forums in all participating countries guarantees sustainability beyond 2014 at least in the short to medium term (3

years). Continued resource mobilisation, membership drive and sustaining high activity level and impact should be high priority. High activity level needs vibrant working groups. The ET registers concern with the status of the CBE/CBO and the Training Working Groups, which need support so that they are more active. The ET recommends, funds allowing, that the Forums should recruit an additional person to oversee the revival and maintenance of TWGs. This should be a key area of focus for the Forums as they implement their national strategic plans.

b) Institutional setup of SACF:

As discussed earlier, SACF is not yet registered and is operating as an unregistered institution; this is a concern to most stakeholders in the region. Over the 11 years, the PMU hosted by WWF (firstly in Zimbabwe and now in Zambia) acted as a de-facto Secretariat for SACF and successfully coordinated regional level activities under the guidance of the regional steering committee. This has helped immensely to give structure and visibility of “SACF” and to provide a platform to explore and implement sustainability considerations such as registration and fundraising. A transition from the current into a formal regional SACF has come too late to guarantee sustainability at this stage. It is important to note that enough progress has been made to anchor SACF and it is justifiable to anticipate that SACF will be sustainable once it is formalised and perhaps hand held for at least 12 months. There is an active steering committee, vibrant regional MOMS working group, regional best practice guidelines and a regional website to give the SACF a regional image already. SACF is well known and acknowledged in its current state, and this is a good stance. It is important for the Steering Committee to dialogue with WWF ROA for possible minimal support perhaps 12 months to allow SACF to fortify under its new state.

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

Annex 9: Achievement Rating Scale

- 1 = fully achieved, very few or no shortcomings
- 2 = largely achieved, despite a few short-comings
- 3 = only partially achieved, benefits and shortcomings finely balanced
- 4 = very limited achievement, extensive shortcomings
- 5 = not achieved

Objective Statement	Achievement % Rating	Average Rating	Logframe Indicators	Baseline for Indicators	Progress against the Indicators (See Section 4.4. on Effectiveness for detailed narrative)	Comments on changes over the last year, including unintended impacts
Programme Goal: Improved rural livelihoods at the household level attained through sustainable management of natural resources by communities in southern Africa	65%	3	% increase in aggregated income and benefits from cash income, employment, and in-kind benefits derived from sustainable use of natural resources.	BW – US\$ 7,647,862 (2009); MW – US\$ 532,162 (2006); NM – US\$ 5,700,000 (2009); ZM - US\$ 1,235,938 (2005); ZW - US\$ 2,251,841 (2006)	No consolidated national updated figures but specific cases (Botswana Ngamiland CBOs; Zambia Baobab enterprise; Malawi USACOL community and fisheries in Shire; and Namibia Conservancies and Zimbabwe CAMPFIRE Districts all demonstrate an increase in CBNRM revenue.	More CBOS establishing
	70%		% increase in income accruing to communities from benefit sharing arrangements in wildlife, forestry and fisheries		Programme has contributed towards improving conditions for increased revenue flows to households new revenue sharing arrangements in Malawi, Botswana and Zimbabwe (direct payments) instituted.	
	65%		Increase in the number and type of natural resources under community management	4 (Wildlife. Fisheries. Forestry products, Marine) (2009)	Increased focus on non wildlife sectors as demonstrated in specific enterprises sites (e.g. Machinga in Malawi, Mutasa in Zimbabwe, Luangwa in Zambia), fish (Malawi), and birds (Malawi and Botswana), and mineral resources (Zambia and Zimbabwe) and Cultural heritage sites in Botswana)	
	65%		Area under CBNRM increased by at least 3% in each of the six participating countries			

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

Objective Statement	Achievement % Rating	Average Rating	Logframe Indicators	Baseline for Indicators	Progress against the Indicators (See Section 4.4. on Effectiveness for detailed narrative)	Comments on changes over the last year, including unintended impacts
	Overall 66.25%			- No data (2009)	No national or regional baseline data but there is evidence of increase in areas under conservation in specific sites supported by the programme. Including: MOMS pilot and roll out sites in four of the participating countries, Majete, Liwonde Parks and Machinga Forests in Malawi, honey production forest areas, fishing sites in lake Chilwa. Namibia, number of registered conservancies increased from 4 (1990s) to over 80 (to date), Botswana is registering now CBOs indicating increased interest in conserving resources in their areas.	
<u>Programme Purpose (target):</u> CBNRM principles, policies and practice adopted as a mainstream strategy in southern Africa for sustainable natural resource management in a manner that promotes equitable access to, use and management of natural resources	90%	2	CBNRM incorporated in national development plans of at least five of six participating partner countries;	- 5 (Zambia 5th NDP. Namibia Vision 2030. Botswana Vision 2016) (2009)	CBNRM appears in national development plans of 3 countries - Namibia, Zambia and Malawi. In other countries CBNRM principles are incorporated	
	85%		CBNRM incorporated into at least three other ³¹ national sectoral policies (i.e., agriculture, rangeland management and water), in all of the six countries	0 (2009)	New incorporations of CBNRM principles in the following 4 sectors: Mining (Zimbabwe and Zambia); Tobacco farming (Malawi and Zimbabwe); Water sector (Malawi); Community plantation forestry in Zimbabwe; National REDD strategy in Mozambique; National Climate Change Policy and Strategy for Zambia and Zimbabwe; Zimbabwe's new constitution	
	50%					

³¹ Other than/broader than wildlife, forestry, fisheries and tourism.

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

Objective Statement	Achievement % Rating	Average Rating	Logframe Indicators	Baseline for Indicators	Progress against the Indicators (See Section 4.4. on Effectiveness for detailed narrative)	Comments on changes over the last year, including unintended impacts
	90%		Formal CBNRM legislation present in four of the six partner countries;	1 (Botswana) (2009)	has elaborate environmental rights.	
	85%		CBNRM principles incorporated into climate change adaption and mitigation activities and policies ³² in at least three of the six countries	- 0 (2010)	Nambia has a CBNRM Policy. Botswana is working towards an Act and establishing a CBNRM Directorate in the Ministry of Environment and Tourism	
	Overall 80%		CBNRM CBOs are actively reinvesting in the management of natural resources activities from benefits derived from CBNRM in all six participating partner countries.	- Botswana:? - Malawi:? - Mozambique:? - Namibia: yes - Zambia:? - Zimbabwe: yes (2009)	Five countries have participated in REDD+ or Climate Change Policy Formulation and implementation of Climate Change related activities. CBNRM Principles incorporated in national frameworks	
			Development of a regional (SADC) CBNRM framework	0 (2010)	Evidence from Malawi (USACOL, Majete and fisheries and honey sector); Botswana hunting sector, Zimbabwe CAMPFIRE districts and honey producers where community groups are investing in anti-poaching, resource monitoring, fire management, hunting teams escorts, repairing fences.	
					CBNRM models, manuals, guidelines, baseline status reports and performance monitoring frameworks have been developed and, to some extent best practice and approaches identified. Communication and coordination mechanisms are in place. These form the basis for formulating the regional framework.	

³² This will be in collaboration with climate change initiatives underway within the region, including WWF efforts.

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

Objective Statement	Achievement % Rating	Average Rating	Logframe Indicators	Baseline for Indicators	Progress against the Indicators (See Section 4.4. on Effectiveness for detailed narrative)	Comments on changes over the last year, including unintended impacts
					The framework has not been developed.	
Output 1: Institutional strengthening	80%	3	Six national forums are formally constituted and active by June 2011 (i.e. Legal entities, developed strategies, holding meetings)	- 2 (Zambia / Namibia) (Jan 2010)	All six forums are in place and formally constituted in different forms. All six have raised funding in addition to the WWF Norway Funding. Within this funding institutional support to run the	Tanzania and Kenya have CBNRM Forums through the influence of the programme
	70%		Six national forums are self sustaining by 2013 (I.e. Generating 100% of their budgets, independent of the PMU).	1 (Namibia) (Jan 2010)	Forum Secretariats funds are very low or absent. They have not been able to generate 100% of their budgets.	
	40%		The Regional Forum is self sustaining by December 2014.	The Regional Forum is currently supported by WWF-Norway	SACF is not yet registered and has not managed to raise funds of its own although it is actively promoting CBNRM knowledge dissemination and practical application of tools , and facilitating positive changes to policy development and implementation at a regional and international	
	60%		The Regional Forum is independently and actively promoting CBNRM knowledge dissemination and practical application of tools , and facilitating positive changes to policy development and implementation at a regional and international level by December 2014.	NOK8.5million in 2010 / ... which accounts for ?% of the operational costs?		
	Overall 62.5%			No forum		
Output 2: Consolidating best practices and capacity building in core CBNRM processes³³	95%	2	At least xx practical tools & applications developed and shared through with CBNRM support providers by December 2014. ³⁴	0 Jan 2010	27 manuals and guidelines were produced and all appear on the SCF website	a few publications have been produced in partnership with other programmes namely with COPASSA, IIED and University of Florida
	80%		At least 10 exchange visits for	0 Jan 2010	4 Regional exchange visits	

³⁴ (Note for proposed text in the modules: In the following areas):

- MOMS

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

Objective Statement	Achievement % Rating	Average Rating	Logframe Indicators	Baseline for Indicators	Progress against the Indicators (See Section 4.4. on Effectiveness for detailed narrative)	Comments on changes over the last year, including unintended impacts
A. Practical tools & applications	60%		Regional and National Working Groups on the above tools and applications held (including documenting and sharing of lessons) At least 2 Workshops per module for Regional and National Working Groups carried out by December 2014 (including documenting and sharing of lessons)	0 Jan 2010	conducted (Community Based Tourism, Baobab, Honey enterprises; MOM technical support visits also conducted) 8 regional workshops conducted and various national workshops covering 9 modules. Documenting lessons learnt did not receive much attention. Keynote CBNRM publication not produced by SACF.	Collaboration with IIED, COPASSA and the University of Florida enhanced the programmes access to resources and contribution to production of technical publications on CBNRM.
	75%		At least half the number of best practices (listed under 2.3) regionally shared, endorsed, adapted and implemented at country level in at least 5 countries by December 2014	0 Jan 2010	Status and Stocktaking Reports are acknowledged as important resources produced by the programme.	
	75%		At least eight people per country trained in each of the best practice modules developed (field based training) by Dec 2014	0 Jan 2010	6 best practices implemented namely MOMS, PME systems, CBO governance, Policy engagement & advocacy and Revenue sharing and Private/Public/Community partnerships	
	Overall 77%					
B. Cross cutting issues thematic areas: including Gender, HIV & AIDS and Climate	25%	4	Gender integrated into CBNRM programme activities in all national forums activities by December 2014. At least 4 of the 7 forums develop	- 0 (Jan 2010) - 0 (Jan 2010) No. of women in Forums No. of CBNRM activities	Regional study on Gender and HIV and AIDS mainstreaming conducted but recommendations not incorporated into Forum	

- CBO Governance – dashboard, management, governance, financial management, benefit distribution
- CBE / JVs / tenders/ marketing / product development / R&D, veldt products, distribution, beneficiation, capitalization, etc.
- Human Wildlife Conflicts (HWC), compensation, mitigation
- Quota setting – utilisation of quotas, mitigation
- Management planning (land use, zoning), scenario planning
- Resource inventory - game counts, forests, biodiversity assessment
- Fisheries management
- Habitat management, e.g., fire management, productivity improvement
- Conservation Agriculture, Agroforestry

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

Objective Statement	Achievement % Rating	Average Rating	Logframe Indicators	Baseline for Indicators	Progress against the Indicators (See Section 4.4. on Effectiveness for detailed narrative)	Comments on changes over the last year, including unintended impacts
Change mainstreaming (cross cutting issues)	70% Overall 47.5%		functional partnerships with the relevant organisations for gender, HIV/AIDS and CC. ³⁵ Climate Change integrated into programme activities in all national forums by December 2014.	promoted including women % of women involved in activities No. of CBNRM Forums activity promoting CC	activities. Two countries conducted mainstreaming training and one country has a gender institution on the Forum. Beyond this there is little else to show for efforts towards mainstreaming gender. Considerable effort to participate in Climate Change policy forums and partnerships with Climate Change implementing organisations evident e.g. with OXFAM (Zambia), LEAD SEA – Malawi) and SASSCAL (Zambia and Botswana).	
Output 3: Performance Monitoring, Evaluation and Dissemination	60% 90% (Pilot sites)	3	Roll-out of MOMS good practice facilitated in each of the six countries by December 2012 (institutionalisation of a MOMS support team, implementation by 50% of CBOs in each country). At least eight best practice demonstration sites per country operating by December 2014.	- 1 (Namibia) (Jan 2010) - Namibia: 50 Malawi: 6 Botswana: 6 Mozambique: 1 (Jan 2010)	Regional technical MOMS support team established with presence in each country. All 6 countries (Botswana, Namibia, Mozambique, Malawi, Zambia, Zimbabwe) have functional MOMS teams. All six countries have MOMS sites Namibia at least 50 sites; Botswana 6 in wildlife; Malawi 6 in Wildlife, Forestry and Fisheries; Zimbabwe 1 site in wildlife), Mozambique 1 site, and Zambia 3 in wildlife, bee keeping and conservation farming. MOMS piloted in a good range	Most of the current sites are pilot.

³⁵ Cooperation in implementation of activities

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

Objective Statement	Achievement % Rating	Average Rating	Logframe Indicators	Baseline for Indicators	Progress against the Indicators (See Section 4.4. on Effectiveness for detailed narrative)	Comments on changes over the last year, including unintended impacts
	60%		PME processes established in each country for evaluating CBNRM programme and national performance through ME and reporting results and impacts on the ground	- 0 (Jan 2010)	of sectors (Fisheries, Forestry, Wildlife, Beekeeping and Conservation Farming)	
	55%		Documenting impact of CBNRM at a regional level through production of a Regional State of CBNRM Report by December 2012.	- 0 (Jan 2010)	2 out of six countries (Namibia and Malawi) have about 50% of their CBOs implementing MOMS. The regional framework was developed. Four out of the six countries (Botswana, Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe) developed their national PM&E frameworks. Three countries (Botswana, Malawi and Namibia) had started implementing the PM&E framework. Achievement has been partial. 4 countries produced CBNRM Status Reports. Publication documenting impact of CBNRM not yet produced	
	Overall Score 66.25%					
Output 4 Policy development and implementation	85%	2	Positive policy reforms / development and implementation relating to communities and natural resource management achieved in at least 4 of the six countries /CBNRM principles incorporated in legal frameworks present in four of the seven countries and the regional ³⁶	- 0 (Jan 2010)	Botswana and Namibia now have CBRM Policies. Forums taking lead in implementation. CBNRM appears in national development plans of Namibia, Zambia and Malawi. In other countries CBNRM principles are incorporated. Forums were involved in policy reviews, development,	

³⁶ Legal frameworks include national constitutions, policies, laws, regional protocols

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

Objective Statement	Achievement % Rating	Average Rating	Logframe Indicators	Baseline for Indicators	Progress against the Indicators (See Section 4.4. on Effectiveness for detailed narrative)	Comments on changes over the last year, including unintended impacts
	90% Overall 87.5%		All forums are actively providing input into CBNRM policy development processes ³⁷		advocacy and implementation in areas where CBNRM is relevant or is likely to be impacted i.e. Climate change adaptation and mitigation; Constitutional reviews; Forestry, Wildlife, Energy, Water, Environment, Mining, and purely CBNRM policies.	
Output 5 Conclude support to select existing partner training institutions	90%	2	CBNRM curricula institutionalised at five colleges by December 2012	- 2 (Nyamaluma, SAWC) (Jan 2010)	15 academic institutions engaged and curriculum reforms influenced - Botswana, (Wildlife College and University of Botswana), Malawi, (Mpwapwe Fisheries College in Mangochi, Malawi College of Forestry and Wildlife in Dedza and Natural Resources College); Zambia (Zambia College of Forestry, University of Zambia), Namibia (Namibia Polytechnic); Zimbabwe (Mushandike Wildlife College, Bindura University and CASS at University of Zimbabwe) and in South Africa, (the Southern African Wildlife College (SAWC)). Formal reviews and development of curricular for CBNRM was undertaken for Malawi College of Fisheries, Zambia Forestry College, and the Wildlife College in Zimbabwe.	

³⁷ Input can be in the form of policy briefs, workshops for policy makers/parliamentarians, tracking of policy implementation through the PME framework etc.

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

Objective Statement	Achievement % Rating	Average Rating	Logframe Indicators	Baseline for Indicators	Progress against the Indicators (See Section 4.4. on Effectiveness for detailed narrative)	Comments on changes over the last year, including unintended impacts
Output 6 Programme Management	100%	1	PMU providing effective and efficient secretariat support to the Regional CBNRM Forum by December 2011, enabling it to achieve Outputs 1-5	- March 2010: No Coordinator or Assistant in place.	Coordinating office in place and effectively coordinating activities through national forums.	

Annex 10 Highlights of Programme Achievements

Output 1: Institutional Strengthening

(iv) *National Forums are functional and self-sustaining by 2014:* All countries established national Forums except South Africa. Legal status and effectiveness varied from country to country. Zambia and Zimbabwe have registered entities. In Botswana, the Kalahari Conservation Society (KCS) hosts the Forum. The Government of Botswana is likely to establish the Botswana Forum within government and ultimately be independent as CSABO. In Malawi, Coordination Union for the Rehabilitation of the Environment (CURE), a network of conservation NGOs and CBOs hosts the Forum. Tanzania registered the Tanzania Natural Resources Forum (TNRFF) independently under which CBNRM falls, and Namibia has always operated NACSO as a registered entity. In Mozambique, efforts are underway for an alliance of NGOs to form a CBNRM Forum. Umbrella associations for CBOs were part of the membership e.g. BOCOBONET in Botswana and various other Independent Associations in Malawi and other countries. The respective national governments recognize all Forums as agents of CBNRM with an approved constitution, a broad membership base and active membership incorporating public sector, CBOs, NGOs, and relevant social, technical, gender and legal expertise. The Forums have strategic plans with activities linked to that plan. Private Sector representation is a weakness of all Forums with the exception of Namibia.

(v) *The Regional Forum is self-sustaining by December 2014:* The programme has not fully delivered this output, as SACF has not transitioned into an independent entity. Although the PMU was successfully established and constituted under the guidance of WWF leadership and the regional steering committee, both the regional steering committee and the PMU were expected to take lead in the establishment of a formalised SACF. SACF is unregistered. Apart from developing a regional strategic plan, a logo, and putting in place regional coordination mechanisms (work plans, website, regional guidelines and standards, PME framework etc) the programme has not achieved this crucial output. When it finally comes, as has been indicated, SACF would have lost on opportunities to be strengthened by the programme. This has had implications on SACF visibility (all concept notes are done in the name of WWF on behalf of SACF), its ability to engage strategic partners (without legal status, SACF cannot sign any contracts or agreements), extend its geographic focus and fundraise. There is anticipation that the WWF Zambia Office will host SACF and provide minimal support to SACF and support organizational development and resources mobilization after the project ends.

(vi) *The Regional Forum is independently and actively promoting CBNRM knowledge dissemination and practical application of tools, and facilitating positive changes to policy development and implementation at a regional and international level by December 2014:* The Regional Forum although unregistered had an active Programme Management Unit. The PMU successfully designed operational work programme at regional level and guided implementation of individual Forums, developed common standards, MOMS, CBE, training guidelines, facilitated production of status reports in collaboration with COPASSA, developed programme reporting formats and self-assessment forms and established a regional website. The PMU also coordinated external reviews, programme audits, exchange visits, regional conferences, and exchange of information and best practice across the region. However, the PME framework (except for the MOMS), the Strategic Plan and the Communication Strategy were not effectively implemented.

Output 2: Consolidating best practices and capacity building in core CBNRM processes

(c) **Practical tools & applications:** The programme produced 17 training modules, manuals and guidelines and different countries adopted these. The programme used modules mostly for informal training. The programme conducted a number of CBO informal training workshops in all the

six countries, particularly, on monitoring using the manuals. Colleges and Universities used the CBNRM Guidelines as reference materials at colleges and universities in all the countries; the Malawi, Zimbabwe, Zambia and Botswana Forums are using MOMS extensively. In Malawi Forum is translating MOMS manuals are undergoing translation into the local language. In Namibia, the demand for guides was increasing. The PMU has uploaded several tools on the SACF website, providing a wealth of information to CBNRM practitioners, academic institutions and policy makers. These resources are available on <http://www.sacfnet.org/index.php/resources/manuals>.

(d) Cross cutting issues thematic areas: including Gender, HIV & AIDS and Climate Change mainstreaming (cross cutting issues): Despite that in all the countries, HIV & AIDS and gender inequalities have remained important issues, this output was only 25% achieved. While issues of HIV & AIDS and Gender were just as important as any programme component, they were not given due attention. The programme managed to organize two trainings on Gender and HIV & AIDS and to conduct a regional study on Gender Mainstreaming³⁸. Namibia stands out with practical actions on HIV & AIDS Policy, awareness and prevention having taken place; whilst Zimbabwe has conducted gender and HIV/AIDS mainstreaming training for its members. Beyond this, nothing much was implemented. The programme was supposed to develop training manuals on HIV & AIDS and Gender. Most reports from Forums were void of gender-disaggregated data. The list of participants in meetings and workshops and Forum membership was the easiest starting point for gender disaggregated data collection. Any progress on HIV & AIDS and gender mainstreaming may have just been by default rather than by design.

Considerable effort to participate in Climate Change policy forums and partnerships with Climate Change implementing organisations is evident. Botswana and Zambia collaborated with Southern African Science Service Centre for Climate Change and Livelihoods (SASSCAL). Malawi collaborated with Leadership for Environment and Development -Southern and Eastern Africa (LEAD SEA) in supporting Climate Change. Zambia is implementing a Community Climate Change Adaptation Project with Oxfam. Four forums have participated in REDD+ initiatives and formulation of national climate change policies. Forums need to do a lot more work on incorporating climate change into their CBNRM activities. Forums also need to evaluate and document the extent to which CBNRM is contributing towards addressing climate change impacts.

Output 3: Performance Monitoring, Evaluation and Dissemination

(ii) *Rollout of MOMS good practice facilitated in each of the six countries by December 2012:* As observed in the mid-term review, The PMU coordinated MOMS and received direct and regular support from technical experts. To this extent considerable progress was made in piloting and rolling it out in some countries e.g. Malawi. Most countries implemented MOMs though to varying degrees and successes, through training, stock taking and feedback meetings and regional exchange visits piloting in 23 sites. MOMS also attracted significant support from other funding mechanisms (Annex 8).

The target to have at least 50% of the CBOs in each country implementing MOMS by 2012 having established strong and functional MOMS teams and MOMS data systems in each country was, as noted in the 2012 midterm evaluation, ambitious. Although the range of sectors in which MOMS was applied was broad, MOMS engaged fewer institutions and fewer pilot sites than had been anticipated. Malawi made most progress followed by Botswana. Mozambique, Zambia, Malawi and Botswana Forums are piloting MOMS mainly in wildlife areas. Zambia is also piloting MOMS for other aspects such as beekeeping and conservation farming. The Malawi Forum has successfully applied MOMS in artisanal fisheries. In Mozambique MOMS is being used in Niassa, Zinave

³⁸ Mataure, P., (2008). Mainstreaming HIV/AIDS and Gender into CBNRM in Southern Africa.

(terrestrial) and Quirimbas/Bazaruto (marine). Government Departments in the participating countries have taken an active role signifying the importance they place on MOMS. Lack of resources and high staff turnover has affected piloting and rolling out particularly in Botswana and Zimbabwe. The PMU also made a deliberate decision to slow down. Communities implementing MOMS have cited a number of issues including lack of equipment (e.g. binoculars, forest assessment tools e.g. diameter tapes), data overload, limited capacity to store and process data and expectations raised during Problem Animal Control (PAC) assessments of damage. There is need to consider information technology based MOMS for effective real time, forgery free and paper less system. In this regard, an Ushahidi³⁹ system or a modified version could be of use in future CBNRM programmes. The ET has presented the highlights of the successes and challenges of MOMs in Box 3.

(iii) *PME processes established in each country for evaluating CBNRM programme and national performance through ME and reporting results and impacts on the ground:* The regional framework was developed and four out of the six countries (Botswana, Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe) developed their national PME frameworks. Three countries (Botswana, Malawi and Namibia) had started implementing the PME framework. All countries developed CBNRM Status and Stock taking reports between 2010 and 2012. Namibia produces stock taking annually and Botswana is following suit. There have been good efforts to engage with the National Statistics Office and Ministry of Economic Planning and Development in Malawi (through inviting the representative to the Forum) to include CBNRM data into the national reporting system. The programme has not implemented the frameworks at national and regional levels. Implementation has reportedly been constrained by a number of factors – limited capacity of institutions to implement PME, shortage of staff, resource limitations and an absence of the culture of measurement. There is still a long way to go in operationalising PME, infusing MOMS and having the right coordinating capacity for data management. As long as there is no concerted effort towards operationalising PME CBNRM will continue to suffer from lack of data to prove its worth as a development strategy. CBNRM status and stocktaking reports will also remain largely qualitative in content. Each institution should therefore take up an active role in collecting and submitting CBNRM monitoring data to the CBNRM focal points.

Output 4: Policy development and implementation

(i) *Positive policy reforms/development and implementation relating to communities and natural resource management achieved in at least four of the six countries:* The level of policy engagement by national Forums was an exceptional achievement of the programme. Forums were involved in policy reviews, development, advocacy and implementation in areas of Climate Change adaptation and mitigation; Constitutional review; Forestry, Wildlife, Energy, Water, Environment, Mining, and CBNRM policies. CBNRM principles have been adopted in the mining (Zambia and Zimbabwe), agriculture (Malawi and Zimbabwe) and water (Malawi) sectors. In Malawi, the Department of National Parks and Wildlife implemented the policy on revenue sharing with Parks after the Forum lobbied for its implementation. Namibia and Zambia are engaged in Climate Change adaptation implementation. Because of Forums engagement on policy matters, some national Forums increased their visibility amongst the public including development partners.

Botswana and Namibia now have CBNRM policies. Forums are also taking lead in implementation e.g. in Botswana where the Forum is actively participating and inputting ideas into the establishment of CSABO and the CBNRM Act. CBNRM appears in national development plans of Namibia, Zambia and Malawi.

³⁹ *Ushahidi* is a nonprofit, open-source software company that develops a web based platform that makes it easy for people in any part of the world to gather and distribute data.

Output 5: Conclude support to select existing partner training institutions

The programme largely achieved this output. Besides building on existing effort in Botswana and other countries, the programme effectively engaged 15 academic institutions in the region. These include Botswana, (Wildlife Institute and University of Botswana), Malawi, (Mpwepwe Fisheries College in Mangochi, Malawi College of Forestry and Wildlife in Dedza and Natural Resources College); Zambia (Zambia College of Forestry, University of Zambia), Namibia (Namibia Polytechnic); Zimbabwe (Mushandike Wildlife College, Bindura University and CASS at University of Zimbabwe) and in South Africa, (the Southern African Wildlife College (SAWC)). Malawi College of Fisheries, Zambia Forestry College and the Wildlife College in Zimbabwe reviewed and developed formal curricular for CBNRM.

The process of incorporating CBNRM into curriculum has been long. Other institutions e.g. University of Botswana bemoaned the unclear prospects for employment of CBNRM graduates indicating this has hindered progress in developing and implementing training at diploma and degree levels.

Output 6: Programme Management

It is the view of the ET that the programme had a competent PMU that provided effective and efficient secretariat support to the Regional CBNRM Forum and enabled it and the national forums to achieve Outputs 1-5. As mentioned earlier, the Forum continuously improved systems for programme management for efficient implementation of the programme.

Annex 11: Benefits from CBNRM Enterprises

Studies at household level in selected sites in the region reveal the following:

Botswana: CBNRM revenues increased from P8,800,000 (US\$ 1,518,270.60) in 2006 to P18,100,000 (US\$2,655,105.59) in 2010 (Mbaiwa, 2013 in workshop); Income for individual CBOs in Ngamiland shows that income either doubled or trebled between 2003 and 2011.

Namibia: In 2009, CBNRM generated N\$42.48 million (US\$ 5,107,894.32) of this, N\$35.02 million (US\$4,210,886.51) came from conservancies and the rest was from non-conservancy areas. (NACSO, 2011 Annual Report)

Malawi: In Liwonde new benefit sharing mechanisms have delivered US\$2000/month to USACOL from the National Park in the last 8 months. Honey in Mount Mulanje is contributing 20% of household revenue. Fisheries and bird hunting CBOs are also generating substantial income from fishing activities in the Lake Chilwa basin.

Malawi: Increase in volume of fish trading in Machinga attracted the Malawi Savings Bank to provide a mobile banking services. The bank collected Malawi Kwacha 40 million (US\$100,000) monthly in deposits during the 2013-2014 fishing season. This data has been collected using MOMS.

Zambia: A new Baobab juice enterprise project is promising success and aquaculture venture has just started.

Annex 12 MOMS Successes and Challenges

MOMS is a local level monitoring and decision making tool. It is a flagship initiative of the programme that was initiated from Namibia where it is commonly known as the Event Book.

Who is driving MOMS?

Government Departments are the main drivers of MOMS in all the four countries that are implementing MOMS.

- a) Botswana – the Department of Wildlife and Parks in collaboration with CBOs;
- b) Malawi- Departments of National Parks and Wildlife, Fisheries and Forestry are the main drivers in collaboration with CBOs championed by the MOMS/PME Working Group;
- c) Namibia- Ministry of Environment and Tourism in collaboration with NACSO, WWF and other Partners;
- d) Zambia – the Zambian Wildlife Authority and the Zambia Forum
- e) Zimbabwe, Parks and Wildlife Management Authority in collaboration with Rural District Councils and Bio Hub Trust.

MOMS has proved its potency as an approach for enhancing community participation in managing their natural resources. State authorities responsible for wildlife, forests, fish, and birds have embraced MOMS as a mechanism to reinforce their existing monitoring mechanisms and to build sense of ownership and responsibility among local communities.

How has MOMS information been used?

Information collected from MOMS has been used for decision-making purposes. These include:-

- a) Controlling fishing effort and fence repairs in Malawi;
- b) Planning anti-poaching activities (in all countries);
- c) Designing fire management regimes (in all countries);
- d) Understanding trends in income and investments (in Malawi mobile banking services had to be introduced as a result of better understanding of the level of cash transaction around fish trade);
- e) Understanding the status of wildlife, protected plant species and rare fish species;
- f) Managing human-wildlife conflict in Malawi, Zimbabwe, Botswana, Namibia and Zambia;
- g) Maintaining revenue sharing records and making financial savings;
- h) Planning for targeting households affected by disasters because of wildlife, floods and drought.
- i) MOMS data complements aerial and other scientific survey findings collected by Research Units in these countries.
- j) The quality of future National CBNRM Profiles will certainly improve.
- k) Data from MOMS is feeding into the overall national monitoring and reporting framework.

What are the other positive outcomes from implementing MOMS?

Apart from contributing to decision making as stated above, MOMS application has been broad. In Zambia and Malawi MOMS is being applied to conservation agriculture, bee keeping, HIV & AIDS; catchment management projects and other livelihood initiatives. Through MOMS, the programme has introduced a culture of record keeping and measurement among local communities and enhanced responsibility over resources. The initiative has strengthened collaboration and partnerships between government and local communities. Locals involved in fishing and bird hunting in Malawi acknowledge that MOMS data complements indigenous knowledge systems. MOMS is an attractive initiative to other development partners in Zambia, Malawi and Botswana such as The Nature Conservancy (TNC), World Bank, LEAD-SEA, EU, UNDP, USAID and SASSCAL.

What have been the challenges in implementing MOMS?

MOMS implementation has experienced some challenges key of which are:

- a) High staff turnover within government agencies and local communities that are implementing MOMS. This has necessitated continuous training to maintain the necessary skills levels.
- b) MOMS require many resources for printing data collection materials. This includes stationery, equipment for replicating and binding event books and human resources. Most countries have been constrained in replicating MOMS. Manufacturing of pocket books was a challenge in Zambia and Botswana.
- c) The continuous review of the modules meant they could not be duplicated in bulk.
- d) Some communities e.g. in Malawi and Zambia, have experienced data overload. In some sites, the loose forms were difficult to keep. There is a risk of losing forms and thus loss of information.
- e) MOMS was also compromised by lack of basic equipment such as diameter tapes for measuring trees, binoculars for identifying birds and cameras for capturing evidence.
- f) Homestead visits conducted to assess losses from wildlife damage tend to raise expectations for compensation.
- g) Some resource monitors viewed modules as complicated and difficult to complete and analyse.
- h) Data collection system is too manual and there is high risk of forgery. Need to consider IT based system.

Annex 13: Conditions for successful replication of the CBNRM programme

- 1) Availability of funds – MOMS for example needs funding for replication. Zambia, Malawi, Botswana and Namibia have successfully raised funds to replicate MOMS. Without this additional funding replication would not have been possible.
- 2) Willingness to shift to new ways of looking at, and doing things will determine scale of replicability. There is evidence from the evaluation that CBNRM practitioners and communities are willing to learn and take on new ideas.
- 3) CBNRM principles need to be up-held for the replication to have similar or incremental effects. Most important is the policy environment, which should be enabling. Unfortunately, policy has not been consistent (in country and overtime) to the extent that replication can deliver the same impact.
- 4) There is need for messengers/champions of the innovations who are well resourced and available to lead, closely monitor and advise on adaptation. MOMS and Policy seems to have ready champions. CBNRM enterprise champions, though they exist, operate in isolation across the region and SACF has a role to play to link them up if replication is to be successful.

Annex 14: Innovation and Best Practices

The ET identified a number of innovative ways. These include:

- 1) Establishing TWGs around strategic CBNRM issues. These groups can easily transform into CBNRM Community of Practice. TWGs appear to work well each time the groups were working on issues relevant to their institutions. The Forum should therefore continue to be a mutually beneficial space for working groups and member institutions.
- 2) MOMS is an innovation with a wide application to other sectors. Whilst its principles are not new, the simple approaches and tools used are new to most countries.
- 3) Botswana has engaged the National Museums and Monuments into the Forum recognising that many natural and cultural sites exist in communal areas and could provide an incentive for wider landscapes conservation. Botswana has just established one pilot site in Mogonye where one can draw lessons. In many countries in the region community based preservation of heritage sites linked to wider landscape conservation involving local communities is limited except in Mapungubwe area of Shashe Limpopo TFCA. Engaging communities through this avenue is a unique approach to scale up CBNRM.
- 4) Payment for Ecosystem Services is slowly taking centre stage in natural resources accounting. Packaging CBNRM as a mechanism for achieving PES objectives is an emerging idea that CBNRM practitioners can champion.
- 5) Zambia Forum has started to implement some innovative financing mechanism to mobilise local resources. Cost recovery for services rendered is one mechanism that Zambia Forum can share with other Forums. Malawi is likely to introduce a 3% levy on tobacco sales tobacco to support conservation.
- 6) Although not an outcome of this programme, there have been many innovations around financing mechanisms in a few countries. All are unique in their own right. For example, MEET in Malawi established out of a USAID endowment Fund; SAFIRE in Zimbabwe once operated a loan Guarantee Fund in partnership with a Commercial Bank to finance natural resources enterprises; Botswana has established an Environment Fund from CBNRM proceeds and Tanzania has established a Tanzania Forest Fund that predominantly supports CBNRM initiatives. The discussion in point 6 above is also relevant here.
- 7) Having a CBNRM Directorate in the Ministry of Environment and Tourism in Botswana is an innovation of the Forum with strong support of Government. Although its institutionalisation is still to be concluded and how it will work still unclear, it will serve as a source of learning on the extent to which CBNRM can be institutionalised, particularly within Government.
- 8) Standardisation of CBNRM monitoring through a regional Level CBNRM PME Framework is an innovation with promising benefits to CBNRM stock taking. M&E can be piecemeal in the absence of such an overarching framework.

Annex 15: Case studies and Stories

Documenting case studies was beyond the scope of this evaluation save for identifying and recommending exceptional experiences for detailed documentation. The ET has identified the following:

- a) *Majete Wildlife Reserve, African Parks Limited, in Malawi*: The Government of Malawi, through the Department of National Parks and Wildlife and Public Private Partnership Commission (PPPC) provided a management concession to African Parks Limited to management Majete Wildlife Reserve. The case study will have to show how this PPP arrangement is working.
- b) *Liwonde National Park and USACOL, in Malawi*: Liwonde National Park and the Upper Shire Association for the Conservation of Liwonde have developed collaborative arrangement for the management of Liwonde National Park. More recently, Government of Malawi approved a benefit sharing mechanism for Liwonde National Park. The case study will have to show how this relationship is working in Malawi.
- c) *Mogonye Cultural and Heritage Site in Botswana* – A number of rural communities have cultural and historic site endowments that can provide incentives for conservation of the wider landscapes. Usually such iconic sites are fenced off and left for Museums Departments to manage. Botswana Museums has collaborated with local communities to manage the heritage site. This case study will be a source of lessons on new partnerships and revenue sharing and lessons on using heritage sites to stimulate wide scale CBNRM initiatives.
- d) *Implementing the CBNRM Policy in Botswana and Namibia*: Botswana and Namibia are the only two countries in the region that have stand-alone CBNRM Policies. The case study would have to show how these countries achieved this.
- e) *Policy shifts in the region – CBNRM responding to the hunting suspension*: The countries of Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe recently suspended hunting in their countries. The case study ought to discuss how this has affected CBNRM.
- f) *MOMS and Event Books in Namibia*: Namibia has been using the local level monitoring for adaptive management for several years. The programme has scaled up the application of MOMS and the Event Book to other countries such as Malawi and Zambia. Why has Namibia been successful in its MOMS and Event Books programme?
- g) *Technical service delivery to conservancies in Namibia*: NACSO, the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET), and other partners constantly provide technical services to conservancies in Namibia. How do they achieve this, what are the challenges, successes and lessons?
- h) *HIV and AIDS interventions in Namibia*: HIV and AIDS still pose challenges amongst conservation organizations in Africa. In Namibia, conservation organizations such as MTE, NACSO, and WWF etc. have partnered with health organizations to provide HIV & AIDS services and products to their organizations.
- i) *Civil Society Advocacy in Zambia (mining in national parks)*: The Zambian CBNRM Forum successfully advocated against proposed mining in a national park by an Australian Mining Company. How did they achieve this and what were the challenges and lessons?
- j) *Establishment of Sustainable Financing Mechanisms for CBNRM*: Noting that CBNRM is no longer amongst funding priorities by some development partners and governments, there is need to do things differently. There is need to streamline CBNRM in government and donor development programs and priorities. CBNRM Champions need to cast their nets wider and think out of the box for sustainable funding initiatives that would ultimately sustain CBNRM programmes in the region. Such initiatives would include the following:-
 - Engaging the CBNRM community to start implementing programs related to Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD+) activities as part of Climate Change mitigation and adaptation measures;
 - Climate Smart Agriculture;
 - Establishing trust funds generated from natural resource management through payment for ecosystem services (PES);

Evaluation Report of the Regional CBNRM Programme

- Engaging the private sector in conservation in collaboration with governments and local communities through Public Private Partnerships (PPPs), for example in ecotourism activities;
 - Lobbying national governments and development partners to allocate adequate financial resources for natural resource management through Sector Wide Approach (SWAp).
- k) *Baobab Enterprise in Malawi and Zambia*: In 1996, the Wildlife and Environmental Society of Malawi (WESM) initiated a project that started to produce Malambe (Baobab) Fruit Juice in 1997 from the mighty Baobab Tree (*Adansonia digitata*). Malambe Fruit Juice, freezes, sweets, powder and jams are now on sell in Malawi's super markets and outlets. The programme organized an exchange visit for the Luangwa Community from Zambia where similar ecological conditions prevail to learn from Malawi. The Luangwa Community has started their Baobab Enterprise with funding from the UNDP Small Grants Programme.

Developing these case studies should be the next preoccupation of SACF and Forums. These topics could be shared through various means e.g. at the end of project review meetings of national Forums, and at the next regional meeting. SACF could call for papers and upload case studies on the website.

Annex 16: Implementation Issues and Challenges

Implementation of the programme faced a number of challenges, which to a certain extent compromised the quality of the output and impact. These are

- (i) *The worst risks/fears and assumptions became reality - Policy shifts:* Policy shift in Zambia, Botswana and Zimbabwe on hunting will certainly see a shift into other forms of CBNRM business. The programme was realistic in anticipating risks and making assumptions during programme design. The assumptions were that national Governments remain committed to decentralisation and devolution, and that international anti-use organisations do not influence governments to prevent use of some natural resources. All countries could anticipate policy shifts in hunting for example the hunting ban in Botswana and Zambia and the suspension of elephant trophy imports from Zimbabwe by the US, but failed to take adequate precaution to reduce the negative effect it has had. The different policies on hunting trophies applied to SADC countries by the US⁴⁰ creates further disharmony in the region.
- (ii) *Agrarian and mining reforms:* Forest areas are under pressure from high wood energy demand (all countries), agriculture, and small and large-scale mining expansion (Zambia, Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Malawi) and the expansion of tobacco farming (Malawi and Zimbabwe).
- (iii) *High staff turnover:* High staff turnover especially among Government staff assigned to the Forums.
- (iv) *Managing expectations:* Some CBOs and NGOs expected financial reward each time they participated in any Forum activity. They also expected to access financial support to capitalize their CBNRM enterprises.
- (v) *Governance and management issues including the absence of a provision in the budget for full time coordinators, funding and reporting delays, weak partners, high staff turn-over in Government, inconsistent participation of Government and inconsistencies in national governance and policy processes such as land reform, hunting ban, ivory import ban, mining in protected areas to mention a few.*
 - a) The programme faced funding challenges in the first two phases, limited budgets for administrative purposes, and funding delays due to late submission of reports and budgets between PMU and Forum Secretariats and lack of a Coordinator.
 - b) Steering Committee meetings were not held as planned as a result of delayed funding or inadequate funding
 - c) There was general high staff turnover especially of Government staff.
 - d) State actors were underfunded and extension services were weak.
 - e) Inconsistent participation of some Government members e.g. the Forestry Department in Malawi is a case in point. There is mushrooming up of uncoordinated and overlapping CBOs operating in the same geographical area and having similar roles and functions because of promising successes of CBNRM.
 - f) For such a capacity building programme to deliver impact there should be resonance between a number of governance processes and related policies. Land reform in Zimbabwe, the hunting suspension in Zambia and Botswana, suspension of elephant trophies import into the US in Tanzania and Zimbabwe, non-renewal of concession leases in Botswana, formalization of artisanal mining in Zimbabwe, mining in protected areas, were some of the sources of derailment towards attaining the projects goal. Weak resonance was a common feature in a few countries and these compromised results of this programme.

⁴⁰ US Fish and Wildlife suspended imports from Tanzania and Zimbabwe and still allows imports of elephant trophies from other African nations, including Namibia, Botswana, and South Africa—although Botswana and Zambia have voluntarily suspended sport hunting.

(vi) Implementation and technical Issues such as limited private sector involvement, failure of some working groups, meetings becoming talk shows and not learning opportunities as planned, inadequate materials and equipment for some activities such as MOMS, limited progress on CBNRM Status Report and failure to engage communities on inland communities on aquaculture and marine/coastal areas.

- a) Private sector involvement in the Forums was a challenge in all countries. Collective action is not within the nature of private entrepreneurship; where there are industry coalitions; they would have a very clear business driven motive, and usually do the bare minimum in terms of costs incurred to achieve that business motive. Even in Namibia, Private Sector partners are not engaged in the Forum but engaged directly with CBOs in business ventures. NGOs sometimes serve as “neutral brokers” to facilitate these partnerships.
- b) Technical Working Groups (TWGs) did not function as desired, except for MOMs, and in some countries such as Zambia and Namibia, Policy Working Group. In Botswana, the policy-working group suffered from a disabling environment.
- c) While meetings offered an opportunity for information sharing, exchange, planning and review; such meetings did not reflect on learning; and members viewed them as only talk shows.
- d) All Forums alluded that there were inadequate materials and equipment to follow up on MOMS. These included vehicles, computers, copiers, torches, binoculars, cameras, gumboots, bags, files, bicycles and inadequate MOMS forms.
- e) Most Forums have not been producing CBNRM Status reports regularly for at least every two years except in Botswana and Namibia.
- f) While capture fisheries was engaged well, e.g. in Malawi; the programme failed to engage inland local communities on aquaculture and marine/coastal areas.

Annex 17 Biographies of Consultants

Biography for Anne Madzara

Anne Madzara is an Environment and Development specialist with over 23 years of experience working in both public and NGO sectors in environment, natural resources based business development, protected areas management, commercialisation, and livelihoods promotion. She has worked for the Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority as an ecologist, CITES office secretariat head and Commercial Director. She also worked for SAFIRE as Community Tourism and Advocacy Officer and later as a Technical Services Manager. She is currently the Director of STEP Zimbabwe and consultant. As an ecologist she has been involved in fisheries and wildlife management and research, participatory resource surveys and action planning for the purpose of promoting natural resource based small and large scale commercial ventures including protected areas management. With the ecological and business background, Anne has been instrumental in facilitating conception, planning and development of natural resources based enterprises by the institutions she has worked for and by rural communities in forestry, wildlife, tourism and fisheries.

She is a seasoned consultant who has provided expert services in project feasibility studies, project evaluations, resources inventorying, women economic empowerment framework development, gender mainstreaming and policy analysis. She has advised Government and a number of agencies in environment and development fields in Zimbabwe and in the region.

Anne has a Masters in Business Administration (Nottingham Business School, 2007); MSc in Aquatic and Natural Sciences, (Stirling Scotland, 1992); BSc Hons. Biological Sciences (Ecology and Zoology) – (University of Zimbabwe, 1989). Diploma in Land and Agrarian Studies (University of Western Cape, 2004) and she is currently concluding a Masters Degree in Development Studies at the Women’s University in Africa. She has also received other training in Participatory Planning in Environmental Protection; Gender Analysis in the Environment and Wildlife Sector; Basic Micro and macroeconomics; Project Appraisal and Quantitative Methods; Results based Planning, Participatory Rural Appraisal, Vulnerability and Livelihoods Assessments.

Biography for Daulos D.C. Mauambeta

Daulos Mauambeta is former Executive Director, Forestry Programme Director, Forestry Programme Officer and Projects Officer for Wildlife and Environmental Society of Malawi (WESM) from 1993 to 2011. Prior to joining WESM, he worked as a Secondary School Teacher in the Malawi Ministry of Education and Culture; and a Parks and Wildlife Officer in the Malawi Department of National Parks and Wildlife. He retired from WESM in 2011 and went into full consultancy work, thereafter. He was a Senior Lecturer at the Catholic University of Malawi.

Daulos Mauambeta has over twenty five years of professional experience in sustainable land use practices including conservation agriculture, agroforestry, permaculture, wildlife management; forestry management, soil and water conservation, eco-tourism; environmental education; biodiversity conservation; community based natural resources management (CBNRM), agro-based and natural resource based enterprises; and general food security and livelihoods issues.

Daulos is an advocate of sustainable development using Participatory Integrated Community Development (PICD) approaches such as Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA), Appreciative Inquiry Assessment (AIA); STAR Study Circles and similar approaches. He is also a monitoring and evaluation champion of programs using various tools such as Management Oriented Monitoring Systems (MOMS), Project Cycle Management (PCM), Objectives-Oriented Project Planning (ZOPP), and Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (PME).

As a Consultant, Daulos has vast experience in areas of conducting baseline surveys; gap/status/situation analysis; mid-term and end of project evaluations, project reviews; providing technical assistance to organizations; project proposal development and reviews; book / report reviews, organizational development and capacity building of front line staff in various technical fields. He is very good at emerging issues such as development of sustainable financing mechanisms e.g. Sector Wide Approaches (SWAs) and Trusts Funds; Climate Change including REDD+ Issues; extractive industry; quality basic and tertiary education; linkages of HIV & AIDS and conservation; and Gender Issues in development. He has done work for a number of clients including governments, NGOs and multilateral donors.

Daulos is a member of various professional associations and has been entrusted with a number of responsibilities both at local, national, regional and international level because of his skills, experience and knowledge on issues of governance, environment and natural resources management, to advise and assist in the running of various committees, groups, boards and institutions both in Government and Civil Society Organizations in Malawi and abroad.

As a professional, Daulos has produced over 50 different publications either on his own or in collaboration with other professionals. Most of his publications have assisted professionals, technicians and rural communities to improve their knowledge and skills in natural resource and environmental management issues. Daulos has travelled to 52 countries on various professional and training assignments.

Daulos is currently a PhD candidate in *Development Studies* at Chancellor College, University of Malawi. He holds a Master's Degree in *Forestry and Its relation to Land Use* from Oxford University (1994); a Bachelors' Degree of Education Science (1991) and Diploma in Education Science (1989) from University of Malawi. He also holds several technical and professional qualifications from various institutions of higher learning.