



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

## Project Midterm Review Report

# Project: Enhancing the Forest Nature Reserves Network for Biodiversity Conservation in Tanzania, Africa Region

UNDP GEF PIMS 5106 / GEF ID 5034; Atlas Award 00083123/  
Atlas Project ID 00091754

Evaluation period – March – May 2018; Report Date 27<sup>th</sup> April 2018  
Implementing Partner: Tanzania Forest Services (TFS) Ministry of  
Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT)

GEF Focal Area - *Conservation & sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance of ecosystem goods/services*

Strategic Program - *Biodiversity conserved and habitat maintained in national protected area systems*

**Evaluation Team Leader: Veronica Nyawira Muthui; [nyawira.muthui@gmail.com](mailto:nyawira.muthui@gmail.com)**

**Evaluation Team member: Stephen Mariki; [stephenmariki49@gmail.com](mailto:stephenmariki49@gmail.com)**

## Project Summary

Project Title:	Enhancing the Forest Nature Reserves Network for Biodiversity Conservation in Tanzania
UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#s	UNDP GEF PIMS 5106 / GEF ID 5034; Atlas Award 00083123/ Atlas Project ID 00091754
MTR time frame and date of MTR report	Evaluation timeframe – March to May 2018 Date of evaluation Report – April 2018
Region and country	Africa, Tanzania
GEF Focal Areas	GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program GEF's Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy, ' <i>Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance of ecosystem goods and services</i> '/ <i>Biodiversity conserved and habitat maintained in national protected area systems</i> <sup>1</sup>
Executing Agency/ Implementing Partner	Tanzania Forest Services (TFS) Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT)
MTR team members	Nyawira Muthui and Stephen Mariki
UNDAP Outcomes and outputs:	<u>Cluster 1</u> : Growth for reduction of income poverty <u>Component 2</u> : <i>Environment and Climate Change</i> <u>Outcome 2</u> : Relevant MDAs, LGAs and Non-State Actors improve enforcement of environment laws and regulations for the protection of ecosystems, biodiversity and the sustainable management of natural resources <u>Output 2.3</u> : <i>Improved capacity for sustainable management of protected areas, coastal forest, and marine ecosystems including policy and regulatory frameworks</i>
Project Period	5 years: start date 2015: End Date - 2019
Project Cost	US\$23,700,000: GEF – US\$ 4,100,000; Co-finance US\$19,600,000

**Acknowledgements:** The evaluators recognize and thank the Tanzania Forestry Service, the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) and the UNDP Country Office for the efficient and professional organizational support they provided during this review. The Project Coordinator (Gerald Kamwenda), the Forest Nature Reserve's Conservators and their subordinates (Gertruda Nganyagwa, Magamba; Abeid Kindo, Mkingu; and Innocent Lupembe, Mt. Rungwe) and the Practice Specialist (Environment & Natural Resources) Unit at UNDP Tanzania (Gertrude Lyatuu) deserve a special mention for the professional manner in which they facilitated the MTR process. Thanks also go to the Regional Councils, the communities and other partners involved in the implementation of the project for the information provided during the review. Mr. (Hamis Mziray) is gratefully acknowledged for the safe transportation across the vast Tanzanian territory.

<sup>1</sup> This project is from GEF 5 where the concept of programmes is absent. It was under objective 1: Improved sustainability of protected areas

## Contents

1	Executive summary.....	5
2	Introduction.....	13
2.1	<b>Objectives of the MTR.....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.2	<b>MTR Approach and Methodology.....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.3	<b>Limitations of the MTR.....</b>	<b>16</b>
2.4	<b>Structure of the MTR Report.....</b>	<b>16</b>
3	Project Description and Background Context.....	16
3.1	<b>Development Context.....</b>	<b>16</b>
3.2	<b>Threats and barriers targeted.....</b>	<b>18</b>
3.3	<b>Project Description and Strategy: Objective, outcomes and expected results.....</b>	<b>18</b>
3.4	<b>Project Implementation arrangement.....</b>	<b>19</b>
3.5	<b>Project timing and milestones.....</b>	<b>20</b>
3.6	<b>Main stakeholders: Summary list.....</b>	<b>21</b>
4	Findings.....	22
4.1	<b>Project Strategy - satisfactory.....</b>	<b>22</b>
4.1.1	Project Design - satisfactory.....	22
4.1.2	Results Framework/Logframe: Satisfactory.....	29
4.2	<b>Progress towards Results – highly satisfactory.....</b>	<b>30</b>
4.3	<b>Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective.....</b>	<b>34</b>
4.4	<b>Project Implementation and Adaptive Management - Satisfactory.....</b>	<b>34</b>
4.4.1	Work Planning - Satisfactory.....	34
4.4.2	Finance and Co-finance – highly Satisfactory.....	35
4.4.3	Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems – highly Satisfactory.....	37
4.4.4	Stakeholder Engagement.....	37
4.4.5	Reporting.....	38
4.4.6	Communication.....	39
4.5	<b>Sustainability - unlikely.....</b>	<b>39</b>
4.5.1	Financial risks to sustainability - Significant.....	39
4.5.2	Socio-economics Risk to Sustainability – Significant.....	40
4.5.3	Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability – Insignificant.....	41
4.5.4	Environmental risks to sustainability - Insignificant.....	41
5	Conclusions and Recommendations.....	42
5.1	<b>Conclusions.....</b>	<b>42</b>
5.2	<b>Recommendations.....</b>	<b>43</b>
6	Annexes.....	44
6.1	<b>Annex 1: MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes).....</b>	<b>44</b>
6.2	<b>Annex 2: MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology).....</b>	<b>52</b>
6.3	<b>Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection.....</b>	<b>54</b>
6.4	<b>Annex 4: Ratings Scales.....</b>	<b>57</b>
6.5	<b>Annex 5: MTR mission itinerary.....</b>	<b>58</b>
6.6	<b>Annex 6: List of persons interviewed.....</b>	<b>59</b>
6.7	<b>Annex 7: List of documents reviewed.....</b>	<b>60</b>
6.8	<b>Annex 8: Co-financing table.....</b>	<b>61</b>
6.9	<b>Annex 9: midterm METT and Financial Sustainability.....</b>	<b>62</b>

## List of Tables

Table 1: Project Stakeholder List.....	21
Table 2: Summary of Project Components and Outputs.....	24
Table 3: Stakeholder Perceptions of Project Relevance to their Circumstances.....	26
Table 4: Project assumptions against assumptions validity criteria. T=True; F = False.....	27
Table 5: Status of risks and the impact on implementation and progress towards outcomes.....	28
Table 6: Project Indicators.....	29
Table 7: Progress towards Results Matrix.....	31
Table 8: Project Expenditure from its Commencement to 18-03-2018.....	35
Table 9: State of Co-Finance Summary at MTR.....	36
Table 10: Summary of recommendations (see the Executive Summary).....	43

## Abbreviations and Acronyms

APR	Annual Progress Report
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBF	Community Based Forestry
CBFM	Community Based Forest Management
CBNRM	Community-Based Natural Resource Management
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species
CO	(UNDP) Country Office
COP	Conference of Parties
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
DANIDA	Danish Agency for Development Assistance
DFID	United Kingdom Department for International Development
DFO	District Forest Officer
DLR	Department of Lands and Registration
DLUP	District Land Use Plan
EAMCEF	Eastern Arc Mountains Conservation Endowment Fund
EBA	Endemic Bird Area
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMA	Environmental Management Act
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation (of the United Nations)
FBD	Forest and Beekeeping Division (of the MNRT)
FCFP	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (World Bank)
FINNIDA	Finnish International Development Agency
FIP	Forest Investment Programme (World Bank)
FNR	Forest Nature Reserve
FR	Forest Reserve
FRA	Forest Resource Assessment
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographical Information System
GMP	General Management Plan
GoT	Government of Tanzania
GR	Game Reserve
IBA	Important Bird Area
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
JFM	Joint Forest Management
JMA	Joint Management Agreement
KBA	Key Biodiversity Area
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
METT	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool

MNRT	Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTR	Midterm Review
MWLD	Ministry of Water and Livestock Development
NEP	National Environmental Policy
NFP	National Forest Programme
NFR	National Forest Reserve
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
NIM	National Implementation (Modality)
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NP	National Park
PA	Protected Area
PC	Project Coordinator
PFM	Participatory Forest Management
PIR	Project Implementation Report
PPP	Public-Private –Partnership/ Purchasing Power Parity
PPR	Project Progress Report
PSC	Project Steering Committee
REGROW	Resilient Natural Resource Management for Tourism Growth
RCU	(UNDP) Regional Coordinating Unit
RMP	Reserve Management Plan
RTA	(UNDP) Regional Technical Adviser
SP	Strategic Programme
TANAPA	Tanzania National Parks Authority
TFCG	Tanzania Forest Conservation Group
TFF	Tanzania Forest Fund
TFS	Tanzania Forest Service
TTB	Tanzania Tourism Board
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Environment, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNFCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
URT	United Republic of Tanzania
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VEMP	Village Environmental Management Plan
VFMA	Village Forest Management Area
VLFR	Village Land Forest Reserve
VPO	Vice Presidents Office
WB	World Bank
WCST	Wildlife Conservation Society of Tanzania
WHS	World Heritage Site
WMA	Wildlife Management Area
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

# 1 Executive summary

## *Project Information Table*

Project Title:	Enhancing the Forest Nature Reserves Network for Biodiversity Conservation in Tanzania
UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#s	UNDP GEF PIMS 5106 / GEF ID 5034; Atlas Award 00083123/ Atlas Project ID 00091754
GEF Focal Areas	GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program GEF's Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy, ' <i>Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance of ecosystem goods and services</i> '/ <i>Biodiversity conserved and habitat maintained in national protected area systems</i> <sup>2</sup>
Executing Agency/ Implementing Partner	Tanzania Forest Services (TFS) Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT)
UNDAP Outcomes and outputs:	<u>Cluster 1</u> : Growth for reduction of income poverty <u>Component 2</u> : <i>Environment and Climate Change</i> <u>Outcome 2</u> : Relevant MDAs, LGAs and Non-State Actors improve enforcement of environment laws and regulations for the protection of ecosystems, biodiversity and the sustainable management of natural resources <u>Output 2.3</u> : <i>Improved capacity for sustainable management of protected areas, coastal forest, and marine ecosystems including policy and regulatory frameworks</i>
Project Period	5 years: start date 2015: End Date - 2019
Project Cost	US\$23,700,000: GEF – US\$ 4,100,000; Co-finance US\$19,600,000

## *Brief Project Description*

1. The project was designed to remove the barriers hindering the forest stakeholders from addressing the drivers and threats to forests and biodiversity in the Forest Nature Reserves. Direct threats to the forests include clearance for subsistence agriculture, charcoal production, timber extraction and wildfires. In recent years, additional pressures have emerged, including the threat of mining (e.g. for alluvial gold). Underlying these threats are deeper social, political and economic issues including an increasing demand for agricultural and timber products, endemic poverty, weak governance, marginalization of rural communities and women, weak land tenure, and low levels of political will to conserve forests. Climate change is likely to exacerbate the effects of these threats.
2. The two barriers identified by project design are: management deficiencies in the expansion, planning and operational management of FNRs; and, insufficient funding allocated for improving the management of the sub-network of FNRs. The project strategy has two components and seven outputs. Under component 1 (Consolidating and improving the management of the FNR network), the project will secure conservation status and boundaries of the six new FNRs (by completing the process of gazettelement); it will put in place core staff, infrastructure and equipment of the six new FNRs; it will strengthen the governance of, and benefit sharing, in these new FNRs; and, it will improve the capacity of the Tanzania Forestry Service to plan and manage the six FNRs, as part of a wider network of Nature Reserves. Under component 2 (Strengthening the financial sustainability of the FNR network), the project will ensure that commercial development of tourism and recreational facilities and

<sup>2</sup> This project is from GEF 5 where the concept of programmes is absent. It was under objective 1: Improved sustainability of protected areas

services in FNRs is implemented through public-private partnerships; it will then ensure effective marketing of the destinations, attractions, facilities and services in the Nature Reserves to target audiences; and, it will identify and test other income-generating activities in targeted Forest Nature Reserves.

3. The project will improve biodiversity conservation in 13 *Forest Nature Reserves*, the category of protected area that offers the highest level of protection under the Forest Act in Tanzania. It is noted that the project originally targeted 11 Nature Reserves. The Project Steering Committee expanded the number to 11 and the government has added one more. Forest Nature Reserves are state-owned and managed by the Tanzania Forest Service. The overarching impact pathway is increasing management capacity and financial resources (and predictability of finances), which is expected to increase the number of Forest Nature Reserves from five to thirteen, increasing area under Forest Nature Reserves by 118,717 (from 186,883 ha to 305,600 ha), accompanied by 30 Joint Management Agreements. Managing the different Forest Nature Reserves as a unit is critical to the realization of impacts in this pathway. The second impact pathway is increasing engagement of multiple and relevant stakeholders in the improved management of the Forest Nature Reserves, expected to improve forest governance while simultaneously increasing benefits to the stakeholders sustainably.
4. The total cost of the five-year project is US\$23,700,000, to which GEF contributes 17 percent (US\$ 4,100,000) and the government and other partner co-finance contributes 83 percent (US\$19,600,000). The project is implemented through a National Implementation Mode. The Tanzania Forest Service is the lead Implementing Partner.

### ***Project Progress Summary***

5. Overall project implementation is rated Satisfactory. The project has delivered 72% of the end of project targets with a budget expenditure of 67.69 percent and a co-finance mobilization of 52.8 percent. Notable deliverables include the gazettement of seven Nature Reserves, increasing the number of Nature Reserves from 5 to 12 (soon to be 13) and area covered by Nature Reserves from 86,883 ha to 305,600 ha; protection of site level endemics and threatened animals increased from 129 to 195 and 12 to 34 respectively; kilometres of roads and footpaths increased from 17 to 158 and 34 to 230 respectively; all six Nature Reserves have signed MOUs with all affected villages; the number of subsidiary FNR Tourism Development Plans increase from 0 to 11; 2 nature-based tourism concessions have been awarded; the number of visitors to Nature reserves has increased from below 200 to over 5,000 and community members benefiting from income generating activities exceeded the target of 100. The average Management Effectiveness index for the 11 Nature Reserves has increased from 64 percent; and, construction of the Zonal Offices and Ranger Posts is at about 75 percent of completion.
6. The MTR finds that the project design was based on a clear and highly participatory analysis of the threats, root causes and barriers to the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystems services of the Forest Nature Reserves; and that the project was developed with the full support of the Government and is in line with all the key policies relevant to the natural resources sector. It addressed urgent priorities identified in the country's key development and biodiversity policies and programs. However, a new barrier to community engagement in joint forest management and increasing financial security for the FNRs has emerged, in the form of the new directive on revenues. The government has directed that all revenue generated by government units be remitted to the Central Treasury to be allocated via the budgetary process. This new development will require the Tanzania Forestry Service to devise new options to deliver community share of the revenues raised via eco-tourism. Processing community benefits through the budgetary processes may increase transaction costs and delay communities' access to their benefits. The MTR finds that the project



expenditure and Project monitoring is being done using a Project M&E Plan developed in the first year of implementation, which the MTR considers a best practice. The project has produced several publications and communicates effectively through the website <http://www.nature-reserves.go.tz>.

***MTR Ratings and Achievement Summary Table***

<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Rating</b>
Project Strategy - Project design Results Framework/ Logframe	Satisfactory
Progress Towards Results	Satisfactory
Management Arrangements	Satisfactory
Work Planning	Satisfactory
Finance and co-finance	Highly Satisfactory
Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems	Highly Satisfactory
Stakeholder Engagement	Satisfactory
Reporting and communication	Satisfactory
a) Overall Sustainability b) Financial risks to sustainability c) Socio-economic risks to sustainability d) Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability e) Environmental risks to sustainability:	a) Unlikely b) Significant c) Significant d) Insignificant e) Insignificant

***Table of key achievements and deliverables***

<b>Result</b>	<b>Progress to date</b>
<b>Component 1: Consolidating and improving the management of the FNR network</b>	

<p>Output 1.1: The conservation status and boundaries of six FNRs are secured</p> <p>Output 1.2: The core staffing complement, infrastructure and equipment of six FNRs is in place</p> <p>Output 1.3 The governance of, and benefit sharing in, six FNRs is strengthened</p> <p>Output 1.4: The capacity of the TFS to plan and manage the six FNRs, as part of a wider network of FNRs, is improved</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The six FNRs have been formally gazetted.</li> <li>• The FNRs have approved overarching Reserve Management Plans that are being operationalised annually through Annual Plan of Operations.</li> <li>• The boundaries of the FNRs have been surveyed and demarcation is on-going;</li> <li>• The entry points to the 6 FNRs have been secured and signposted; signposts have been placed in many strategic locations advertising and directing visitors to the FNRs.</li> <li>• All households living in adjacent villages are informed about, and aware of, the conservation status, implications and potential benefits of the FNR. Indeed, all the six FNRs have concluded and signed a collaborative MOU with each adjacent village government (over 200 villages). Some adjacent villages are starting to derive tangible benefits from income generating activities, especially where co-finance partners are present (Chome, Magamba). In addition, all the FNRs have functional co-management structures in place, with representation of each adjacent village;</li> <li>• Twelve Ranger Posts and 6 FNR Headquarters Office Blocks are under construction (at about 75% completion); The Ranger Posts will offer good quality basic accommodation units for key staff (~2-3 staff).</li> <li>• All the 6 FNRs have acquired basic transport capability (One four Wheel Drive vehicle and a motor cycle).</li> <li>• Over 600 km of road and footpaths have been repaired and/or maintained and adequately signposted.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Component 2: Strengthening the financial sustainability of the FNR network</b></p>	
<p>Output 2.1: The commercial development of tourism and recreational facilities and services in FNRs is implemented through public-private partnerships (PPP).</p> <p>Output 2.2: The destinations, attractions, facilities and services in FNRs are effectively marketed to target audiences</p> <p>Output 2.3: Other income-generating activities in targeted FNRs are identified and tested.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subsidiary Tourism Development Plans have been developed for each FNR</li> <li>• A TFS Tourism Concessions Manual has been developed and two concessions issued to private sector operators.</li> <li>• Training events and study tours have been conducted for all the Conservators and their Assistants.</li> <li>• Brand and awareness raising materials (brochures, pamphlets, diaries, calendars, and information sheets) have been created for all the Nature Reserves, and are distributed widely, including on the website <a href="http://www.nature-reserves.go.tz">http://www.nature-reserves.go.tz</a>. Indeed, the visual identity of FNRs have been integrated into all FNR communication and marketing materials (e.g. signage, uniforms, letterheads, brochures, presentation folders, stickers, fact sheets, website, advertising material, entry tickets, etc.).</li> </ul>

***Concise summary of conclusions***

7. The project complies with the Global Environment Facility strategic objectives to ‘Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems’ and contributes to the Outcomes on ‘Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas’; and ‘Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management’.

8. The Project strategy and implementation arrangements build on national structures and systems that not only ensure ownership by implementing institutions (Tanzania Forest Service and partners) but also reduces project overhead costs as applied conventionally in Project Management Units.
9. The project implementation draws on a wide range of co-financing arrangements and partnerships from the main implementing agency, other government institutions, and Non-Government Organizations and development partners to support the Forest Nature Reserves network, which explains the significant achievements the project registered in the first half of the implementation period.
10. Sustainability of the project interventions hinges on guaranteed financial sustainability. While Tanzania Forest Service demonstrates confidence for continued support in the management of the Forest Nature Reserves, the infancy of revenue generation from these reserves leaves their management susceptible should Tanzania Forest Service fail to sufficiently provide the needed financial resources.
11. The project did not have a gender action plan or gender disaggregated indicators. Most indicators adopted do not need to be disaggregated by gender due to the nature of the indicators themselves – e.g. kilometres of roads cleared, number of completed offices, etc. There are however relevant gender issues that affect the project. For example, the nature of forestry sector is such that it is dominated by men; hence the forest Conservators are mainly men. This means the Project Steering Committee is also dominated by men, as are decision-makers in the sector. Although the project is unlikely to change this structural dynamic, it should be aware of its impact on the gender marker of the project. More importantly, formulation and implementation of the Joint Forest Management Plans should be guided by a gender action plan to ensure full capture of gender issues and that implementation is cognizant of, and delivers benefits equitably across all gender groups. As the project has planned to design a project gender action plan, this offers an opportunity to capture and address these issues.

**Recommendation Summary Table**

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>
<b>Recommendation 1:</b> It is recognized that most activities in the newly gazetted Nature Reserves are in their initial stages of implementation under various partners support. These are expected to continue beyond the project period and therefore the need to share lessons and best practices. It is recommended that a formal partners' forum be identified for information sharing and dissemination within and beyond the project lifetime. The forums can be at Nature Reserve and National level, and should target Non-Government Organizations, foundations and the private sector - locally and internationally. The CTA should provide links to the relevant and potential members, particularly at the international level.	TFS	During 2018
<b>Recommendation 2:</b> Management of the FNRs will largely depend on sustainable financing generated from tourism related value chain targeting ecotourism in the FNRs. The development of FNRs as nature-based tourism and recreation destinations is identified as a role to be played in collaboration with the private sector. Assessments of potential for tourism has now been completed for all the FNRs and tourism development plans developed. Implementing these plans will require serious engagement with the private sector. It is recommended that partnerships be developed with the tourism related organizations at the national and international levels. They include TANAPA, TAWA and the private sector (locally and abroad) to market and invest appropriately in these FNRs.	TFS and PT in collaboration with TTB	During 2018
<b>Recommendation 3:</b> The long-term solution the project seeks is the effective and secure management of the Forest Nature Reserves network, by		Beginning May 2018

<p>ensuring that individual Reserves are adequately resourced and have sufficient staff and sustainable funding. It is recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient numbers of staff with the necessary skills are provided by the TFS;</li> <li>• Adequate funding is allocated in annual TFS budgets;</li> <li>• Further fundraising initiatives in terms of co-financing are pursued.</li> </ul>	TFS, TFS +UNDP	
<p><b>Recommendation 4:</b> Between 2015 and 2017, six additional Nature Reserves were gazetted. The success resulted in enthusiasm for expansion of new Reserves including Hanang (2016) and Magombera (2018). While this is a positive development, it is recommended that addition of new Nature Reserves be undertaken strategically in consideration of the necessary facilitation that will be required including development of the basic infrastructure and technical and institutional capacity to effectively manage the Reserves.</p>	TFS	From June 2018
<p><b>Recommendation 5:</b> The fundamental incentive for community participation in Joint Forest Management is an assurance of tangible benefits. The established Forest nature Reserves are yet to generate adequate revenues for sharing. Complementary income generating activities are being promoted outside the Nature Reserves as an alternative incentive. It is recommended that adequate support be provided for these income generating activities, to be raised from additional co-finance, to be mobilized by all the partners. Communities need to realize adequate/significant benefits for renewed Joint Forest Management and co-management, in order to sustain their interest and commitment to collaboration.</p>	TFS, NGO and DPs	Immediate
<p><b>Recommendation 6:</b> The new government has directed that all revenues generated by government entities, including the Tanzania Forest Reserve are submitted to the Central Treasury, from where allocations would be made through the budgetary process. Unless an alternative arrangement (or exemption) is granted, this will make it impossible for the Tanzania Forest Service to share revenues under the Joint Forest Management agreements directly, and increase the transaction costs for processing community share of the revenues. It is recommended that an exemption be negotiated with the Treasury across all Nature Reserves using the Amani revenue sharing model.</p>	TFS	From July 2018
<p><b>Recommendation 7:</b> Signing of Joint Forest Management Agreements has been delayed by the district councils meaning communities can not enjoy agreed benefits. It is recommended that respective Conservators follow up with District councils to expedite the approvals.</p>	TFS and NRs Conservators	Immediate
<p><b>Recommendation 8:</b> Execution of the infrastructure development under Outcome 1 was contracted in 2017. In general construction delivery is at about 75%. Some contractors have reached 90% meaning all facilities will be completed by end of 2017/2018 Financial year while the funding was spread across years. It is recommended that UNDP requests an upfront provision of the 2019 funds from the Global Environment Facility to cover the costs for the completed construction works. The 8<sup>th</sup> Project Steering Committee meeting held on April 6<sup>th</sup> 2018 endorsed the recommendation.</p>	UNDP	Immediate
<p><b>Recommendation 9:</b> The MTR noted the decrease of funding from partners that had been committed as co-finance: a) Wildlife Conservation Society has lost United States of America International Development (USAID) funding in Mbeya following the political directive from the President of the United States on USAID funding globally; b) the TFCG-AVA project working in Chome and Mkingu Nature Reserves ended in March 2018. The project supported the Joint Forest Management Agreements, which are yet to be secure final approvals, and there is need to consolidate income generating activities and conservation agriculture. It is recommended that additional resources be mobilized, together with partners to continue these</p>	TFS, UNDP, NGOs	Immediate

important initiatives.		
<b>Recommendation 10:</b> The MTR finds that the implementation of the first quarter activities (January – March) was routinely hampered by delays in disbursements from the UNDP Country Office. Implementation of activities during the first quarters are routinely financed by co-finance resources (from the Tanzania Forest Service) and carry-over/committed funds. It is recommended that the reasons for the regular disbursement delay for the first quarters are identified and addressed by UNDP.	UNDP	Immediate
<b>Recommendation 11:</b> The success in gazettement 12 FNRs means a requirement for additional resources to support their management and effectiveness. It is recommended to continue with initiatives on fundraising now that all the Nature Reserves have been gazetted with updated management plans and the demonstrated potential for tourism including engagement with the private sector.	TFS and UNDP	Immediate
<b>Recommendation 12:</b> Significant co-finance has been delivered but precise figures were not shared by implementing partners. It is recommended that the Project Team liaises with the respective partners to obtain accurate co-financing estimates from these partners. The Project Coordination Team should look into whether the new Chinese funded project for the Tanzania Forest Service offers any chances for Nature Reserve funding, and to form linkages to mobilize such funding.	Project Team	
<b>Recommendation 13:</b> The WB is providing financing for a project on resilient natural resources management for tourism and growth (REGROW) coordinated by MNRT, which aims to support tourism development in the southern circuit. It is recommended that TFS pursues the potential for linking Mt. Rungwe NR with the planned tourism development in the Southern highlands. Similar initiatives should be established with TANAPA and TAWA for NRs where such networks and packages can be developed.	TFS	Immediate
<b>Recommendation 14:</b> It is recommended that establishment of a formal annual forum bringing together the Conservators and Implementing Partners across the entire FNRs network is developed. The Forum would focus on discussing technical issues such as conservation, tourism development, etc.	PC, TFS	From June 2018
<b>Recommendation 15:</b> The Tanzania Tourism Board (TTB) has been identified as a key stakeholder in the development of the FNRs as a tourism product. They have not been engaged in the development of the tourism investment plans and marketing strategies for the FNRs. It is recommended that the TTB is engaged as part of the project marketing and promotion strategy for the tourism products and services in FNRs.	TFS	Immediate
<b>Recommendation 16:</b> Joint Forest Management Plans have been developed. It is recommended that the government mobilizes further funding and partnerships to facilitate the implementation of JFMPs, informed by an assessment of current practices to identify best practices and conditions for successful conservation and beneficiation from implementation of JFMPs. The implementation should be guided by a gender action plan and strategy to ensure equitable distribution of roles, responsibilities and benefits.	TFS	From June 2018
<b>Recommendation 17:</b> The current plan to formulate a gender action plan for the project should be expedited.	TFS	From June 2018

### MTR Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_Veronica Nyawira Muthui\_\_\_\_\_

Signed at *Leverkusen, Germany*, on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2018 -- Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_ Stephen Mariki \_\_\_\_\_

Signed at – Dar es Salaam, Tanzania -- on -27<sup>th</sup> April, 2018 \_\_\_\_\_

**I also approve this MTR report**

- 1) Veronica Muthui, signed at Leverkusen on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2018 \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) Dr. Stephen Mariki, signed at \_Dar, Tanzania on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2018 \_\_\_\_\_

## 2 Introduction

1. The project is at the beginning of its third year of implementation; the Midterm Review (MTR) was therefore conducted in accordance with the guidelines and regulations of UNDP and GEF, and, assessed the overall performance against the project objectives as set out in the Project Document and other related documents; project relevance to national priorities, as well as UNDP and GEF strategic objectives, namely; the effectiveness and efficiency of the project; sustainability of the project interventions and consideration of project impacts; implementation and management arrangements of the project, including financial management. The MTR assessed progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, assessing early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR also reviewed the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

### 2.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

2. The objectives of the MTR are spelled out in the Terms of Reference (ToR - Annex 1). The overall objective is to assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability.

### 2.2 MTR APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

3. The MTR was conducted in close coordination with UNDP, Tanzania Forest Service (TFS) of the Government of Tanzania (GoT), and other Project Partners. The MTR took place from 20<sup>th</sup> March to 30<sup>th</sup> May 2018. The Inception Report (Annex 2) contains the methodologies and activity schedule used to conduct the review. It was prepared in consultation with UNDP and the Project Coordination Unit. The list of persons consulted is given in Annex 3.
4. The review was undertaken in a participatory approach using a mix of desk reviews, in-depth interviews (face-to-face, and by Skype) and physical observation of results on the ground.

#### *Desk review of documents*

5. The key documents reviewed for the review are contained in the Inception Report (Annex 2). They include the UNDP Project Document, the Project Inception Report, the two Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), Minutes of the Project Steering Committee Meetings, Nature Reserve Management Plans, Joint Forest Management Plans, and the TFS, UNDP and GEF strategic program documents. The document review provided a basis for the analysis and enabled the determination of how the project is contributing to national development programs, plans and policies. The review of UNDP and GEF documents was necessary to establish linkages of the project with the umbrella programmes, such as United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), Country Programme and the GEF Strategic Objectives.

#### *Data collection and analysis*

6. The evaluators spent ten days visiting the intervention sites (Chome, Magamba, Mkingu (Kwadoli/Kibati/Mkindo), Mt. Rungwe (Isongole and Kandoro) to assess progress and appreciate the difficulties faced by the project implementers concerning the huge geographic area covered by the project. At each site, the reviewers observed the progress of construction of the facilities (Offices and Rangers Posts) and held structured group discussions with the TFS staff responsible for each Nature Reserve and beneficiaries of project interventions. The reviewers also held discussions with staff of the Tanzania Forest Conservation Group (TFCG), World Wildlife Fund

(WWF) and the Wildlife Conservation Society in Tanzania as well as the Project Steering Committee.

### **Detailed Context**

7. In line with the ToR (Annex 1), the MTR reviewed the following aspects of the project design, implementation and delivery of results:
8. **Project Strategy (Project design and Results Framework/Logframe):** The MTR examined the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions; reviewed the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document; reviewed the relevance of the project strategy and assessed whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results; reviewed whether lessons from other relevant projects were properly incorporated into the project design; examined how the project addresses country priorities and reviewed country ownership. The MTR also reviewed decision-making processes to determine if the planning phase took the perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources; and, the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.
9. **On Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:** The MTR guidelines require review of the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; comparison and analysis of the GEF Tracking Tools at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review; identification of remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project; review of the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identifying ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.
10. **On Management Arrangements:** The MTR requires a review of overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document, determining if changes have been made and if they are effective; examine if responsibilities and reporting lines are clear and if decision-making is transparent and undertaken in a timely manner. Further, the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partners was reviewed along with the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP).
11. **On project implementation,** the review assessed if there has been delays in project start-up and implementation, identifying the causes and examining if they have been solved; it also examined if work-planning processes are results-based, and if changes have been made to the original logframe and if it is being used as a management tool.
12. **On finance and co-finance** - the review assessed; i) Whether strong financial controls have been established that allow the project management team to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, and allow for the timely flow of funds and the payment of satisfactory project deliverables; ii) Variances between planned and actual expenditures; iii) Whether the project demonstrates due diligence in the management of funds, including annual audits; iv) Any changes made to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions; v) Whether co-finance has been delivered in accordance with expectations laid out in the project document, and if the Project Team has made effort to pursue delivery of co-finance.
13. **On stakeholder engagement,** the review assessed whether the project management team developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders; whether local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project and continue to have an active role in project decision-making; whether public awareness has been created to support the project and how stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributes to the progress towards achievement of project objectives.
14. **On reporting and Communication,** the review assessed how adaptive management changes have been reported by the Project Team and shared with the Project Board; how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed



poorly-rated Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) and how these have been shared with the Project Board and other key stakeholders; in addition, it assessed how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners and incorporated into project implementation.

15. **On financial risks to sustainability**, the MTR assessed the likelihood of financial and economic resources being available once the GEF assistance ends, examining the opportunities for financial sustainability and additional factors needed to create an enabling environment for continued financing.
16. **On socio-economic risks to sustainability**, the MTR assessed whether there are social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes; whether there is a risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained; whether lessons learned are being documented continually; and whether successful aspects of the project are being transferred to appropriate parties, potential future beneficiaries, and others who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future.
17. **On institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability**, the MTR assessed; whether the country's legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize project benefits; whether the project has in place frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes that will create mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer after the project's closure; whether the project has developed appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) that will be self-sufficient after the project closure date; and how the project identified and involved champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society) who can promote sustainability of project outcomes; and whether the project leadership have the ability to respond to future institutional and governance changes (i.e. foreseeable changes to local or national political leadership) – thus can the project strategies effectively be incorporated/mainstreamed into future planning?
18. **On environmental risks to sustainability**, the MTR assessed whether there are environmental factors that could undermine and reverse the project's outcomes and results, including factors that have been identified by project stakeholders.
19. **Conclusions & Recommendations:** The MTR offers evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings. Recommendations made are succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. Ratings along the objectives will be provided in accordance with the guidelines in Box 1 (below).

Box 1: Progress towards results rating scale

**Highly Satisfactory (HS)** --- The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.

**Satisfactory (S)** -- The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.

**Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** -- The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.

**Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** -- The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.

**Unsatisfactory (U)** -- The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.

**Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** -- (HU) The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. C. Project Implementation & Adaptive

## 2.3 LIMITATIONS OF THE MTR

20. The project covers an extensive area of the country (See Map in Figure 1). The MTR team was unable to visit sites in Uzungwa, Minziro and Mount Hanang NRs due to logistics and accessibility of the sites as this was a rainy season. The mission to Dodoma (Mount Hanang NR) was cancelled due to complications of logistics which forced the mission to be scheduled over the Easter weekend, forcing cancellation. However, arrangements put in place enabled the review team to interview TFS staff members responsible for all the FNRs not visited at the PSC debriefing meeting held in Morogoro on April 6. The review team was, however, unable to meet with beneficiaries from these Nature Reserves. The review team does not believe that this compromised the MTR findings as the responses of the TFS staff of Dodoma was cross referenced with other documents such as the PIR, the M&E plan, the minutes of the Project Board meetings, financial and audit reports as well as technical publications of the project.

## 2.4 STRUCTURE OF THE MTR REPORT

21. The MTR Report is in line with the UNDP-GEF Evaluation guidelines. The first page presents the details of the project. This is followed by an executive summary, highlighting the key findings, evaluation ratings, lessons learnt and recommendations. Chapter One – Introduction – presents the purpose and objectives of the MTR, the scope and methodology. Chapter Two presents the project description, background and context. Chapter Three presents the evaluation findings, while Chapter Four presents the conclusions and recommendations. Annexes are found in Chapter Six.

# 3 Project Description and Background Context

## 3.1 DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

22. **Geographical:** The project is planned to be implemented across Tanzania with focus on six nature reserves located in the Eastern Arc Mountains, Southern Highlands, Southern Tanzania and western part of the country. The FNRs are found in a wide variety of physical features, from a narrow coastal belt to an extensive plateau covered by savannah and woodland vegetation.
23. **Socio-economic:** The main drivers of national growth are agriculture, manufacturing, wholesale and retail trade, transport and communication activities. The real growth rate of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) - estimated at US\$27.98 billion in 2012 - has increased annually between 2010 and 2012 at an average of 6.6% per annum. Tanzania's medium-term growth prospects are around 7%, significantly boosted by natural gas discoveries and vast mineral resources. The basic productive systems are sensitive to environmental degradation including water supply from the nature reserves especially on agriculture and hydropower generation. The agriculture sector accounts for more than a quarter of the GDP, provides 85% of exports and employs about 80% of the work force. Tanzania's industrial and construction sector that account for 24.1% of GDP, have also been severely affected by persistent power shortages.
24. Tourism, one of the fastest growing sectors in the country, accounts for an estimated 17% of Tanzania's GDP with tourism contributing more than 25% of foreign exchange earnings. The project builds on promoting tourism in the NRs whose potential is yet to be optimized.
25. **Biodiversity:** Tanzania is a major repository of globally significant biodiversity. It ranks amongst the top countries in tropical Africa in terms of the representivity of ecoregions, richness of species and extent of species endemism. Over thirty major vegetation communities are recognized, hosting more than 10,000 plant species (of which more than 15% are endemic). Tanzania has two areas designated by Conservation International as Global Biodiversity Hotspots: the Eastern Afro-

montane forests (Eastern Arc and Albertine Rift components); and the Eastern African Coastal Forests. The intended project outcomes directly contribute to effective management of these global biodiversity hotspots.

26. Tanzania's 39.5 million ha forest area includes closed canopy high forests on the ancient mountains of the Eastern Arc catchment forests (~350,000 ha) and high forest systems containing significant biodiversity and considerable endemism that include the *Eastern Arc Mountains*, part of the Eastern Afromontane hotspot; and the *Southern Rift Highlands*, that harbour the six targeted NRs as well as the other FNR networks.
27. **Forest Nature Reserves and Forest governance:** The Forest Act (14 of 2002) provides for four types of forests namely the National *Forest Reserves* (NFR) managed by Central Government that include the *Forest Nature Reserves* (FNR; Local Authority *Forest Reserves* (LAFR) which are reserved by local; Village *Forest Reserves* (VFR) and Private Forests. The *Forest Nature Reserve* (FNR) category that offers the highest level of protection under the Forest Act. To date, twelve FNRs with a total of 313,059.26 ha have been gazetted (a 13<sup>th</sup> soon). All 12 FNR sites are identified as Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs); Important Bird Areas (IBAs) and Important Plant Areas (IPAs). Four sites are also Alliance for Zero Extinction sites and eight form part of a proposed serial nomination for inscription of the Eastern Arc Mountains forests as a World Heritage site.
28. The Forest Act (2002) also provides for delegated responsibility for the management of forest resources to the lowest possible level of local management consistent with the national policies through PFM approaches namely (i) enabling local communities to declare and gazette Village, Group or Private Forest Reserves; and (ii) allowing communities to enter into agreements with government and other forest owners for joint forest management agreements. Joint Forest Management (JFM) takes place on reserved land owned and managed by either central or local government where villagers enter into management agreements either central or local government regarding the use and management of the forest. Implementation of the project capitalizes application of these forest governance models.
29. **Institutional:** The *Tanzania Forest Service* (TFS) Agency is an executive MNRT mandated with the establishment and management of national Forest Reserves. The operational management of government Forest Reserves is devolved to the seven *Zonal Offices*, headed by Zonal Office Managers reporting to the Chief Executive. Each zone is spatially divided into a number of districts, each district headed by a District Manager reporting to the Zonal Office Manager. The Forest Nature Reserves located within the seven zones are headed by a Conservator, reporting to the Zonal Office Manager. The FNR staff complement reporting to the Conservator, includes Forest Rangers, Law Enforcement and Administrative staff. Each FNR is divided into 'ranges' controlled by Forest Rangers who assist and report to the Conservator on conservation and law enforcement in the respective range. The review finds this structure being practical for the indicated national implementation approach for the project.
30. Forestry conservation initiatives in Tanzania are supported by a large number of international and national environmental and conservation NGOs. These include among others: *Tanzania Forest Conservation Group* (TFCG); *Wildlife Conservation Society* (WCS); *World wide Fund for Nature – Tanzania Country Office* (WWF-TCO); Mitandao ya Jamii ya Usimamizi wa Misitu Tanzania (*Community Network in Forest Conservation in Tanzania*) (MJUMITA). The project financing is built on working with such partners to leverage resources. The MTR identified these NGOs having critical complementary roles in the project in terms of co-financing and provision of technical support.
31. Tanzania's forest sector has benefited from Development partners (DPs) providing funding, development and technical support to the forest conservation. They include: *Royal Norwegian Government with support for REDD+ and EAMCEF*; *USAID* supporting WCS; *World Bank currently providing funding for the REGROW* (Resilient Natural Resource Management for Tourism Growth) project that is intended to promote tourism in the Tanzanian Southern circuit,

EU providing funding to TFCG for value addition to the Eastern Arc Mt. The MTR notes that the funding from these DPs form part of the project earmarked co-financing.

32. **Policy and Legislative:** Implementation of the project takes advantage of existing policies and legal frameworks. These include the National Environment Policy; *Forest Policy* (1998 now under review) operationalised through the *Forest Act* (2002), Land Policy, the Environment Management Act; the Land Act; and the Village Land Act. These provide mechanisms to involve communities in forest management through Participatory Forest Management that the project implements for the targeted NRs.

## 3.2 THREATS AND BARRIERS TARGETED

### *Threats*

33. Direct threats to the forests as identified and adapted from the *Eastern Arc Strategy* (2009) and adopted by the project include clearance for subsistence agriculture, charcoal production, timber extraction and wildfires and recently, the emerging mining (e.g. for alluvial gold) and clearance for biofuels. These threats were prioritised in terms of their area (extent), importance (severity) and required actions (urgency). The MTR finds the project has also mainstreamed the underlying overarching social, and economic issues including an increasing demand for agricultural and timber products, poverty mainly for marginalized rural communities and women weak governance and weak land tenure. These have been embedded in the implementation strategy in terms of strengthening forest governance and development of economic opportunities for forest adjacent communities.

### *Barriers to achieving the solution*

34. The MTR finds the project is aligned with the goal of the GEF's Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy, '*Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance of ecosystem goods and services*'. The project strategy is intended to realize impact to be measured in terms of the '*Biodiversity conserved and habitat maintained in national protected area systems*', using the indicator '*Intact vegetative cover and degree of fragmentation in national protected area systems measured in hectares as recorded by remote sensing*'.
35. The project will contribute to two Outcomes i) 'Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas'; and ii) 'increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management'. The main barriers to achieving the long-term solution as identified in the ProDoc are i) Management deficiencies in the expansion, planning and operational management of FNRs; and ii) Insufficient funding allocated for improving the management of the sub-network of FNRs
36. The MTR finds the project is well designed for these outcomes to contribute to the country's overall strategy to establish and put in place effective management of a representative national *system* of protected areas that include among others, Forest Reserves and Forest Nature Reserves.
37. The MTR notes the solutions for the FNRs networks lie in developing an ecologically representative network of legally secured FNRs, having an effective institution that is responsible for the efficient and cost-effective management of the network of FNRs; and individual FNRs within the network of FNRs that are sufficiently staffed, adequately resourced and sustainably funded to achieve their defined management objectives. The review finds the logical link between these solutions and the project outcomes.

## 3.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND STRATEGY: OBJECTIVE, OUTCOMES AND EXPECTED RESULTS

38. The project **objective** as indicated in the ProDoc is to: expand, financially secure and strengthen the management effectiveness of Tanzania's forest nature reserves network in response to the

threats to their biodiversity. In order to achieve the project objective and address the barriers, the project's intervention has been organised into two **components**:

39. Component 1: Consolidating and improving the management of the FNR network: Work under this component is focused on improving the legal status, planning, operations and governance of six FNRs (Chome, Magamba, Mkingu, Minziro and Uzungwa Scarp and Rungwe). Component one supports the continued expansion of the FNR network by facilitating the finalization of gazetting of five new FNRs (Chome, Magamba, Mkingu, Minziro and Uzungwa Scarp) and improving the planning, operations and governance of these five new FNRs, as well as one existing FNR (Rungwe).
40. Component 2: Strengthening the financial sustainability of the FNR network. This second component is focused on enhancing the financial sustainability of the entire network of 11 FNRs to ensure that they incrementally develop the capacity (over the longer-term) to generate adequate financial resources to cover the full costs of their management. Component two has three key areas of project support: (i) facilitating public-private partnerships in the commercial development of tourism and recreational facilities and services in FNRs; (ii) marketing the destinations, attractions, facilities and services of FNRs; and (iii) implementing other income-generating activities in targeted FNRs.
41. The MTR finds that the overall project strategy (objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities) are relevant and address the identified threats.

### **3.4 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT**

42. The Forest Nature Reserves (FNR) are administered by the Tanzania Forest Service (TFS). The TFS has the overall responsibility for achieving the project goal and objectives with direct responsibility for creating the enabling conditions for implementation of all project activities including forging partnerships with key players. The project is executed through national structures by a Project Team (PT) led by an appointed national Project Coordinator (PC). The lean PT constituted of the PC and Project Administrative Assistant (PAA) supported by the Head of the Resources Management Directorate (DRM) to act as the Project Director (PD) with the responsibility of providing strategic oversight and guidance to project implementation. The Team is assisted by a team of Technical Advisors, hired international on a part time basis<sup>3</sup>. This Project Team replaced the conventional Project Management Unit (PMU), which the TFS felt would create a new structure operating parallel to the existing government structures. The PT is on regular TFS remuneration which saved project resources that would have otherwise been used for putting in place a parallel PMU.
43. The MTR finds that TFS has managed well this responsibility by mainstreaming implementation of the project into its formal structure. This implementation arrangement will guarantee ownership of project activities when the project phases out. MTR finds that this implementation arrangement has worked well primarily because UNDP and the TFS negotiated an unwritten agreement that the Project Coordinator and the Project Administrative Assistant would not be allocated duties outside the coordination of the project, and that the Project Director would allocate sufficient time to the project. In addition, they agreed that the Project Team would not be transferred to other sections for the duration of the project. This agreement was put to the test in December 2015 when a new Minister took over after the General Elections. However, UNDP was able to access the new Minister who agreed to keep the arrangements in place, exempting the Project Team from internal TFS transfers. It is the view of the MTR that this arrangement constitutes a best practice. The TFS and UNDP decision to use the TA resource creatively has reduced costs and also enhanced the relevance of the inputs received. The PT has worked closely with all partner institutions mainly the LGAs and NGOs to link the project with complementary initiatives in the respective NRs.

---

<sup>3</sup> The team consists of Neil Burgess, Marco Njana and some inputs from Peter Sumbi

44. The MTR finds that a Project Steering Committee (PSC) has been constituted serving as the executive decision making body for the project and ensuring that the project remains on course to deliver the desired outcomes. The PSC is made up of representatives from the MNRT (Policy & Planning), Vice President Office - Division of Environment (GEF Operational Focal Point), (VPO-DoE), President's Office, Regional Administration and Local Government (PO -RALG), UNDP, Forest Beekeeping Division (FBD), and National Environment Management Council (NEMC). Others are the representatives from the Regional Secretariats with respective Forest Nature from Mbeya, Iringa, Morogoro, Kagera, Tanga, Kilimanjaro and Lindi regions. The PSC also includes representative from the Private Sector and NGOs namely the Tanzania Forest Conservation Group (TFCG) and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF TCO).
45. The MTR finds that the PSC has been functional, co-chaired by TFS and UNDP CO. it meets four times a year with two physical meetings held in rotation on one of the Nature Reserves and two virtual meetings. The MTR finds this arrangement innovative as it provides for practical decision making and learning. This arrangement is a strength as planning, implementation, disbursement of funds and reporting uses the existing government systems. The MTR finds no significant weaknesses or threats that will affect delivery of the project outcomes through this implementation arrangement.

### **3.5 PROJECT TIMING AND MILESTONES**

46. The project is under implementation for a 5 Year period starting from 2015. The project was designed with its PIF approved in 2013 and the project agreement signed in June 2015 while the Inception was effected in September 2015. The implementation on the overall has not been delayed. The project is monitored through the following Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) activities that are written into an agreed M&E plan.

#### ***Project start-up:***

47. The Project Inception Workshop was held in September 2015 and involved all key stakeholders. The Inception Workshop was crucial to build ownership for the project's Theory of Change and the anticipated outcomes, outputs and the main activities to be implemented. This milestone was realized as planned.

#### ***Quarterly reports***

48. MTR finds that project progress has been regularly monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform with regular update in ATLAS that generated Project Progress Report (PPR). Quarterly PIR were produced and approved by the PSC.

#### ***Annual reports***

49. MTR finds that the Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR) were regularly produced for years 2016 and 2017, indicating cumulative progress made since the project start against the baselines and targets. The APR/PIR that combined both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements were endorsed by the PSC and also approved by UNDP CO and GEF.

#### ***Periodic Monitoring through site visits***

50. The MTR noted from the NRs Visitor books and Back to Office reports that the Project Team, UNDP CO, Technical Advisors and the UNDP RCU have conducted regular visits to project sites to assess project progress. Field visit Report/BTOR have been prepared by the UNDP CO and UNDP RCU and shared with the project team and Project Steering Committee. These visits have also provide on-site advices to the Conservators and other implementing partners. These included fast tracking signing of the JFM Agreements and the construction of project facilities.

### **Midterm review and Terminal Evaluation**

51. The project has undergone an independent Midterm review in March-April 2018, in line with the planned milestones. The MTR finds that an independent Final Evaluation is planned in the PD to take place three months prior to the final Project Steering Committee meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance.

### **Learning and knowledge sharing**

52. The MTR finds the results from the project have been disseminated within and beyond the project through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project website (<http://www.nature-reserves.go.tz>) is easy to navigate and contains several key reports. The PIR includes documentation of lessons learned and the reports are widely shared in the PSC, website and partners' forums. Various documents have been produced including publications, promotional materials, regular progress reports and researches that have also been publicly shared on the project website<sup>4</sup>.

53. The project team including the Conservators and partners have participated in various learning and exchange visits with relevant institutions such as TANAPA and NCAA. Lessons from these learning included promoting tourism and models for working with partners for none-consumptive protected areas management. The MTR also includes lessons that will inform adaptive management in the last half of the project.

## **3.6 MAIN STAKEHOLDERS: SUMMARY LIST**

54. During the project preparation stage, a stakeholder analysis was undertaken. It identified key stakeholders and assessed their prospective roles and responsibilities in the context of the project. The MTR finds that the key stakeholder identified were relevant in terms of their direct engagement in the implementation as well as facilitating realization of the planned outcomes. The national levels are more on policy and strategic guidance while the LGAs, Civil Society and communities are more field level implementation. A summary of these stakeholders engaged in the implementation of the project is summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1: Project Stakeholder List**

<i>Category/Level</i>	<i>Organisation</i>	<i>Roles and responsibilities in the project</i>
National level Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vice President's Office (VPO), Division of Environment (DoE)</li> <li>• Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT)</li> <li>• Forest and Beekeeping Division (FBD)</li> <li>• Tanzania Forest Service (TFS)</li> <li>• Tanzania Tourist Board (TTB)</li> <li>• National Environment Management Council (NEMC)</li> <li>• Ministry of Energy and Minerals (MEM)</li> <li>• Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MFEP)</li> <li>• President's Office- Regional Administration and Local Government (PORALG)</li> <li>• Regional authorities (Regional Administrative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall policy guidance</li> <li>• Development of the enabling policies and regulations in support of the effective planning and management of FNRs</li> <li>• Assist the project in the marketing and promotion of the tourism products and services in FNRs.</li> <li>• Aligning the project activities and relevant local government initiatives</li> </ul>

<sup>4</sup> An example of the reports is the Subsidiary Eco-Tourism Development Plans for Tanzania Nature Forest Reserves ([http://nature-reserves.go.tz/attachments/Tourism\\_Subsiary%20Ecotourism-Plans%20Final%20draft\(May2017\).pdf](http://nature-reserves.go.tz/attachments/Tourism_Subsiary%20Ecotourism-Plans%20Final%20draft(May2017).pdf)) and a summary issue on NR status across the country, produced in partnership between the project and one of the NGO partners - TFCG <http://www.tfcg.org/pdf/ArcJournal30.pdf>.

<i>Category/Level</i>	<i>Organisation</i>	<i>Roles and responsibilities in the project</i>
	Secretariats, RAS)	
Local Government Authorities (LGAs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Councils</li> <li>• Ward Development Council (WDC)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arbitration and conflict resolution,</li> <li>• Approval of MoUs, bylaws</li> <li>• Provision of technical staff</li> </ul>
Villages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Village Authorities</li> <li>• Village Assembly (Village Council)</li> <li>• Village Natural Resource Committees (VNRC)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secure support, involvement and beneficiation of local communities in project-related activities</li> <li>• Support the in situ implementation of project activities, monitoring and enforcement bylaws</li> </ul>
Development Partners and conservation funds	Multilateral organizations (UNDP, EU, GIZ, World Bank) Development Partners Group (DPG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing technical, financial and material assistance in support of the planning, development and operationalization of FNRs</li> </ul>
National institutions, Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) and Community Based Organisations (CBO's)	NGOs (e.g. TFCG, WWF, WCS, CARE, CI, AWF, CEPF, IUCN, MJUMITA, TNRF) Eastern Arc Mountains Endowment Fund (EAMCEF) CBOs (e.g. women/ youth groups, farmers/hunters associations)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support project activities through the ongoing implementation of complementary interventions in the villages abutting the FNRs</li> </ul>
<i>Villages</i>	Local communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principal stakeholders in the project directly involved in, and benefitting from project activities</li> </ul>
Institutions	Academic institutions and professional associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide technical and professional support</li> </ul>
Private sector		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of FNRs as nature-based tourism and recreation destinations for local and international visitors</li> </ul>

## 4 Findings

### 4.1 PROJECT STRATEGY - SATISFACTORY

#### 4.1.1 PROJECT DESIGN - SATISFACTORY

##### *Challenges addressed by the project and clarity of analysis of the root causes, threats and barriers*

55. According to the project document, Tanzania loses an average of one percent of its forest area every year<sup>5</sup>. The key drivers of deforestation, forest degradation and loss of biodiversity in forested landscapes are uncontrolled fire, conversion of natural habitats to agriculture, illegal logging, unsustainable collection of firewood and building materials, inappropriate mining

<sup>5</sup> Between 1990 and 2010, mainland Tanzania lost 8 million hectares (~ 19 per cent) of its forest cover, equivalent to an average annual loss of about 400,000 hectares.



practices, unsustainable hunting/poaching, unsustainable collection of medicinal plants, unsustainable collection animals for the pet trade, and invasive species. These drivers are exacerbated by underlying deeper social, political and economic issues including an increasing demand for agricultural and timber products, endemic poverty, weak governance, marginalization of rural communities and women, weak land tenure, and low levels of political will to conserve forests. Many of the communities living adjacent to these forests are amongst the poorest in Tanzania. High rates of poverty within these communities mean that there is a high dependency on natural resources to meet food, fuel and shelter requirements. In the context of a growing population, a widening division between rich and poor and growing threats from climate change, these issues are liable to result in increasing rates of deforestation, irreversible biodiversity loss and deeper poverty for forest adjacent communities, particularly women.

56. The long-term solution (goal) of the Government of Tanzania regarding Protected Areas is to have a sub-network of Forest Nature Reserves (FNRs) characterised by:(i) an ecologically representative sub-network of legally secure FNRs that is configured to ensure that populations of forest species can persist in the wild; (ii) a mandated and fully accountable management institution that is responsible for the efficient and cost-effective management of the sub-network of FNRs; and (iii) individual FNRs within the sub-network of FNRs that are sufficiently staffed, adequately resourced and sustainably funded to achieve their defined management objectives.
57. The project strategy was designed to respond directly to the barriers hindering the stakeholders from addressing the drivers and threats to forests and biodiversity in the Forest Nature Reserves. These barriers were identified via a highly participatory process, informed by baseline assessments.
58. The first barrier relates to management deficiencies in the expansion, planning and operational management of FNRs. Between 1997 and 2005, the country gazetted five FNRs – Amani; Uluguru; Kilombero; Nilo; and Rungwe. It had targeted six more NFRs - Chome, Magamba, Mkingu, Uzungwa Scarp, Rondo Plateau and Minziro. However, despite all the technical and consultative preparatory work already being completed, gazettelement had not been achieved by 2014, due to inadequate financial resources to complete the process and provide basic infrastructure and technical and institutional capacity to run the FNRs as protected areas, or coordinate their management as a sub-network of PAs. Upon the formation of Tanzania Forest Service, the small specialised Nature Reserves ‘Coordination Unit’ (linked to the Eastern Arc Mountain Forests Conservation Endowment Fund) was dismantled and staff redeployed to other functional units in the newly established TFS. The management of the FNRs reverted to the Zonal Office of the TFS, reducing coordination between stakeholders and specialist, technical and professional expertise to address the particular conservation management needs of the FNRs (e.g. nature-based tourism development; integrated fire management planning; footpath planning and maintenance; integrated IAS management; strategic and annual management planning; applied research; species monitoring; rehabilitation/restoration management). In addition, there was inadequate community participation in FNR management. While Joint Forest Management (JFM) potentially provides for local communities and the government to cooperate and collaborate in the co-management of FNRs, the lack of clarity on the fiscal (or other) incentives<sup>6</sup> for local communities that are party to a Joint Management Agreement has seriously undermined the efficacy of this model for FNRs. There was therefore inadequate scaling up of best practices on JFM demonstrated by non FNRs projects in the areas covered by the Forest Nature Reserves.
59. The second barrier relates to insufficient funding allocated for improving the management of the sub-network of FNRs. The Project Baseline reports estimated that the total funding requirements

---

<sup>6</sup> The legal status of JFM regarding the sharing of costs and benefits remains unclear. Section 16 of the Forest Act (2002) states that a Joint Management Agreement (JMA) for the management of a forest may be made between various parties, while Section 16 (2) (h) states that the agreement shall include “rules regulating access to, use and division of, and management and audit of any funds which may be made available for, or are generated by the implementation of the agreement”. The Act however, provides no guidance on how the benefits arising from forest management under JFM are to be shared, or the preferred mechanism for doing so. The draft *Joint Forest Management Guidelines* (MNRT, 2007) proposed that direct cash payments be made by the Ministry of Finance and External Affairs (MFEA) to participating communities, but this was not supported by the MFEA.

to support the basic operational management of 10 of the 11 FNRs (excluding Magamba, for which data was not yet available) over the five-year time frame of the project is TZS 36.1 billion, of which TZS 28.7 billion (~80%) represents the financing gap<sup>7</sup>. The administration of FNRs is predominantly financed from government budget allocations, with human resource costs paid directly by the Treasury, while CAPEX and OPEX costs are paid from the annual budget allocations to TFS. The finance gap means basic standards of reserve management are not met, there is no investment in infrastructure, there are business plans and revenue generation is minimal.

60. These threats and barriers were validated by several baseline studies which informed the project design and were confirmed by the stakeholders at project inception and in the course of the interviews conducted during the field mission of the MTR. Accordingly, the project was designed to assist the Tanzania Forest Service to put in place a functioning network of Forest Nature Reserves across the most biodiversity rich forests of the country. The project objective, which expressed the project’s contribution to the long-term desired solution, was to expand, financially secure and strengthen the management effectiveness of Tanzania’s forest nature reserves network. This was to be achieved via the two components, each addressing a key barrier (Table 2).

**Table 2: Summary of Project Components and Outputs**

Component	Outputs
Component 1: Consolidating and improving the management of the FNR network	Output 1.1: The conservation status and boundaries of six FNRs are secured
	Output 1.2: The core staffing complement, infrastructure and equipment of six FNRs is in place
	Output 1.3 The governance of, and benefit sharing in, six FNRs is strengthened
	Output 1.4: The capacity of the TFS to plan and manage the six FNRs, as part of a wider network of FNRs, is improved
Component 2: Strengthening the financial sustainability of the FNR network	Output 2.1: The commercial development of tourism and recreational facilities and services in FNRs is implemented through public-private partnerships (PPP).
	Output 2.2: The destinations, attractions, facilities and services in FNRs are effectively marketed to target audiences
	Output 2.3: Other income-generating activities in targeted FNRs are identified and tested.

61. The MTR finds that the project design was based on a clear analysis of the threats, root causes and barriers to the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystems services of the Forest Nature Reserves. However, a new barrier to community engagement in joint forest management and increasing financial security for the FNRs has emerged, in the form of the new directive on revenues. The new government has directed that all revenues generated by government entities, including the TFS are submitted to the Central Treasury, from where allocations would be made through the budgetary process. Unless an alternative arrangement (or exemption) is granted, this will make it impossible for the TFS to give the communities their share of the revenues under the JFM agreements directly, and increase the transaction costs for processing community share of the revenues, for both the communities and the TFS. It will also reduce the financial security of the FNRs since there is no guarantee that all the revenues they generate will be returned to them via the budgetary process. There is however room for adaptive management on the community revenue: the MTR was informed by the Chief Executive of the TFS that Amani Nature Reserve has applied, and been granted an exemption from submitting the community part of the revenue to the central government. The TFS needs to take up the lesson from the Amani FNR and request exemptions across the board, for the community share of revenues.

<sup>7</sup> Project Document.

### ***What was the theory of change and was it clear?***

62. The project did not state its theory of change; however, two impact pathways emerge, each underlain by several assumptions. The over-arching impact pathway is increasing management capacity and financial resources (and predictability of finances), which is expected to increase the number of Forest Nature Reserves from five to ten, increasing area under Forest Nature Reserves by 118,717 (from 186,883 ha to 305,600 ha), accompanied by 30 Joint Management Agreements. Managing the different Forest Nature Reserves as a unit is critical to the realization of impacts in this pathway. All 11 FNR sites are identified as Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs), Important Bird Areas (IBAs) and Important Plant Areas (IPAs). Four sites are also Alliance for Zero Extinction sites and eight form part of a proposed serial nomination for inscription of the Eastern Arc Mountains forests as a World Heritage site. By increasing management capacities and securing finances, the project will secure and enhance the protection of viable populations of at least 195 locally endemic species (including at least 34 threatened animal species) located within the largest high forest blocks in the country. These include species such as the Rungwe Galago, one of the world's 25 rarest primates, the endangered Usambara Hyliota, Africa's rarest monkey, the Kipunji and Africa's rarest antelope, the Abbott's duiker<sup>8</sup>. Although not designed as a climate change emissions reduction initiative, the project will also secure a carbon reservoir of an estimated 300 tons of carbon/ha; the new sites to be gazetted together have an estimated total carbon store of 35 million tons. In addition, it will secure critical watershed services.
63. The second impact pathway is increasing engagement of multiple and relevant stakeholders in the improved management of the Forest Nature Reserves, expected to improve forest governance while simultaneously increasing benefits to the stakeholders sustainably. The project therefore sort to increase private sector engagement in the expansion of ecotourism, in a bid to fortify Tanzania's attraction as a nature tourism destination. It sort to identify and grow new opportunities for tourism revenue and employment creation, by opening up forest areas as a new tourism product albeit based on best practices from community based tourism elsewhere. Involving communities via Joint Management Agreements would not only improve forest governance, but it would generate significant socio-economic benefits at the local level such as employment as community-based tour guides; sub-contracting of community-based businesses; procurement of locally produced supplies; training and skills development; direct employment of individuals from local communities; participation in the ownership of tourism enterprise; and investment in upgrading local services (water, roads, electricity).

### ***Relevance and stakeholder engagement in the formulation process***

64. The MTR finds that the project addressed urgent priorities identified in the country's key development and biodiversity policies and programs. The project was developed with the full support of the Governments and is in line with all the key Policies of the natural resources sector. Some examples include:
- a) The *National Environment Policy* (NEP, 1997) – contributes to priority 5 (reducing deforestation) and mainstreams forest management into productive
  - b) sectors – agriculture and tourism;
  - c) The *Environmental Management Act* (EMA, 2004) – by providing institutional framework for the effective participation of a broad group of stakeholders in forest management and conservation;
  - d) The *Land Act* (1999) and the *Village Land Act* (1999) by empowering Community-Based Forestry (CBF) at village level (Village Environment Committee, Village Natural Resource Management Committee and Village scouts or guards), through JFM agreements;

---

<sup>8</sup> A more detailed list of the threatened and endemic species in the 11 FNRs is appended in [Section IV, Part VII](#)

e) The *Forest Policy* (1998) operationalised through the *Forest Act* (2002) and the *National Forest Programme* (NFP, 2001) – by applying the regulations and guidelines for community involvement in Participatory Forest Management across both Forest Reserves;

65. Internationally, it is in line with the following conventions and agreements, all of which Tanzania has ratified: Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), the African Convention on the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources; Agenda 21; and the RAMSAR Convention on Wetlands of International Importance. In addition, the project is aligned with the goal of the GEF's Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy, '*Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance of ecosystem goods and services*'. It is consistent with Objective 1 of the biodiversity focal area strategy, '*Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems*', where it will contribute to Outcomes 1 and 2 ('*Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas*'); and '*Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management*') respectively.

66. The relevance of the project to stakeholders was confirmed during the MTR discussions. All the respondents identified various ways in which the project was relevant to their circumstances (Table 3).

**Table 3: Stakeholder Perceptions of Project Relevance to their Circumstances**

Stakeholder group	Relevance				
	Improving water catchment/ water flow	Implementing our mandates	Creating jobs	Improving productivity of the land	Conservation (BD and Ecosystem services)
Technical staff of TFS	x	X	x	x	x
Village Forestry Committee	x	X	x	x	x
CSO	x				x

67. As stated in the Stakeholder engagement section, project formulation was highly participatory and brought together representatives from all relevant sectors of the natural resources management and forestry, the regional and national governments, civil society, academia, communities and development partners. The PPG ensured that perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, were taken into account, and influenced the project strategy, stakeholder participation plan and the project implementation arrangements. However, gender considerations were not taken into account adequately during project design. Although there are intentions to develop a gender action plan, the project did not have a gender mainstreaming strategy and the indicators were not gender sensitive.

***What lessons informed project formulation?***

68. Although there was no specific section of the Prodoc outlining the lessons upon which the project design was based, the MTR finds that in general the design process benefitted from the extensive experience of UNDP, the government, civil society (including communities) and the private sector on formulating biodiversity conservation projects in general and on the management of the Forest Nature Reserves in particular. Indeed, the Prodoc reported that this project formed part of a suite of GEF initiatives aimed at strengthening Tanzania's complex PA system (across different PA categories), and build programmatically on previous and existing GEF projects designed to support forest conservation. In addition, it recognized that during the decade before the project, donor agencies had committed more than a hundred million US dollars on forest conservation activities in the country, the main donors being the Governments of Norway, Denmark, Finland and the Global Environment Facility (GEF). This support had, over the years, helped to establish a network of field-based projects in indigenous forests in the Eastern Arc Mountains, including the gazettement of five Forest Nature Reserves and the preparatory work for the gazettement of the

additional five FNRs that are the subject of this project. Collectively, these projects had generated important lessons on the participatory forest management, provision of products for communities living around forests (including energy systems, fuel efficient stoves, tree planting), income generating activities (such as bee keeping, butterfly farming), research and monitoring and conservation of FNRs. An important lesson learnt from previous interventions is that strengthening the network of Forest Nature Reserves as a whole is critical to improving management of the FNRs, thereby conserving the ecosystem and the services it delivers to the country and the global community (global environmental benefits). While other initiatives strengthened individual FNRs, none had addressed the needs of the network as a whole, a task undertaken by this project.

***Have any of the risks and assumptions played out and what is the effect on implementation and achievement of results?***

69. Assumptions are crucial elements of the project strategy. Assumptions are the *necessary elements that allow for a successful cause-and-effect relationship between different levels of results*. This means that an assumption should be a necessary condition very likely to be present, but beyond the influence of the project. The MTR assessed the assumptions against assumptions validity criteria, i.e. Assumptions must not be a project result, they must be necessary for project success, outside project control and very likely or certain to occur. As shown in Table 4, the assumptions made by the project design were in general true with the exemption of two: a) *the boundary demarcation and infrastructure works do not compromise the ecological integrity of the FNRs* – ensuring the ecological integrity is a fundamental requirement for Nature Reserves. The project and TFS have the mandate of ensuring that boundary demarcation and infrastructure works do not compromise the ecological integrity of the FNRs: b) *Local village government will act in the best interests of local communities with respect to benefits derived from FNRs and project activities* - similarly, this is fundamental for successful joint management of forests and indeed project implementation. The project is indeed working with village communities’ leadership to ensure that by-laws are formulated and community buy-in is ensured. Without community benefits that are equitably shared amongst the community members, the JFM agreements are not likely to be effective instruments of forest conservation with simultaneous benefits from communities.

**Table 4: Project assumptions against assumptions validity criteria. T=True; F = False**

Assumption	Not project result	Very likely to occur	Outside project control	Necessary for project success
The TFS remains the responsible authority for the planning and management of FNRs during the project duration	T	T	T	T
The TFS Zonal offices provide ongoing financial, administrative and technical support to the FNRs	T	T	T	T
The Government supports the gazetting of new FNRs	T	T	T	T
The Government continues to support the natural resource use restrictions in FNRs	T	T	T	T
The enabling policy and strategic planning framework for FNRs and JFM (notably with respect to benefit-sharing) are updated and approved	T	T	T	T
The TFS will not have to re-engage villages and communities in the gazetting of the proposed FNRs	T	T	T	T
The TFS appoints sufficient and suitable management staff to administer and manage the new FNRs	T	T	T	T
Competent local civil engineering businesses are available to implement construction and renovation activities in far-flung FNRs	T	T	T	T

Boundary demarcation and infrastructure works do not compromise the ecological integrity of the FNRs	F	T	F	T
Local village government will act in the best interests of local communities regarding benefits derived from FNRs and project activities	F	T	F	T

70. Project design identified three risks, one was rated high with a moderately high probability of occurring; one was rated medium with a medium probability of occurrence, while one was rated low, with a low probability of occurrence. This placed the project in the **low-medium risk category**. Risks are similar to assumptions in that they are necessary factors for project success but differ in that the likelihood of occurring is higher and the negative impact on the results is significant. The MTR finds that the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are important and the risk ratings applied were appropriate. However, while none of the risks have materialized or affected project implementation or progress towards outcomes, a new risk has emerged: changes in government policy on revenue handling by government entities will likely make it difficult and complicated to deliver the community share of revenues. Although the Amani Nature Reserve is reported to have secured an exemption to this rule, the other Nature Reserves are yet to apply for a similar exemption. Table 5 summarises the status of the risks and how it has affected project implementation.

**Table 5: Status of risks and the impact on implementation and progress towards outcomes**

Identified Risks and Category	Impact	Likelihood	What happened	Impact on project
<p><u>ENVIRONMENTAL</u></p> <p>Local communities living in and around the reserves conflict with TFS over restrictions on their access to, and use of, land and natural resources in FNRs. This conflict in turn leads to a significant increase in the illegal clearance of, and unsustainable levels of harvesting of natural resources from, FNRs by these communities.</p>	<b>HIGH</b>	MODERATELY LIKELY	This risk has not materialized in the older Nature Reserves. However, the implementation of the JFMs has not started in the newly gazetted FNRs.	None
<p><u>FINANCIAL</u></p> <p>The Government and TFS do not commit adequate resources and funding to significantly improve the management effectiveness of FNRs. This may, in turn, limit the interest of the private sector in investing in large-scale tourism concessions in FNRs.</p>	<b>MODERATE</b>	MODERATELY LIKELY	The Government has mainstreamed the cost of managing the newly gazetted FNRs into the budgetary process. In addition, TFS has provided more co-finance than it had committed to (buying six new vehicles for the FNRs). However, despite these positive developments, private sector investments in large scale eco-tourism is yet to happen. The FNRs are however in the process of formulating tourism development business plans.	Increased funding commitment from government has had a positive impact on the project, accelerating achievement of project results on increasing capacity for management and funding.
<p><u>ENVIRONMENTAL</u></p> <p>The effects of climate change further exacerbate the</p>	<b>LOW</b>	UNLIKELY	This risk has not manifested. However, unusually early and heavy rainfall (starting last week of February instead of Mid-March to first week of	Delayed the completion of Ranger Posts and Park Headquarters

Identified Risks and Category	Impact	Likelihood	What happened	Impact on project
fragmentation of high forests in FNRs, leading to an increase in the vulnerability of endemic forest species			April) has destroyed the limited infrastructure leading to the far flung and remote construction sites (for Ranger Posts and FNR Headquarters), derailing the construction plans.	by probably a month.

#### 4.1.2 RESULTS FRAMEWORK/LOGFRAME: SATISFACTORY

71. All the results and indicators formulated in the project document (outcomes, outputs, and targets) respond to SMART criteria as they refer to **specific** and **measurable** results (Table 6). They are all **relevant** to the project's objective and are likely to be achievable within the 5 year timeframe of the project. As reported in Section 3.2 (Progress towards results), the project has already exceeded the end of project targets on several indicators. Table 2 summaries the results (Outcomes and outputs) while Table 6 (below) summaries the project indicators.

**Table 6: Project Indicators**

Strategy	End of Project target
UNDAP Outcome	Business plans show improved financial scorecard for national system of coastal forest protected areas and target landscapes'
GEF Strategic Objective and Program	Protected area management effectiveness as recorded by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool'; and 'Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management'
<b>Objective:</b> To expand, financially secure and strengthen the management effectiveness of Tanzania's forest nature reserves network	Number and extent (ha) of formally gazetted FNRs increases from 5 and 186,883 ha respectively, to 11 and 305,600 ha (respectively)
	Financial sustainability scorecard for FNR network increases from 21 % to 35 %
	Capacity development indicator score for TFS changes as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Systemic: increases from 59% to 62%</li> <li>b. Institutional: increases from 50% to 58%</li> <li>c. Individual: increases from 55% to 62%</li> </ul>
	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool scorecard (average) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Changes from 38% to 51% for all FNRs (averaged)</li> <li>b. Changes from 42% to 52% for all six existing FNRs</li> <li>c. Changes from 33% to 48% for the 5 proposed/new FNRs</li> </ul>
	Income/annum (US\$), by source, from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. TFS budget increases from US\$ 1,763,000 to US\$ 2,500,000</li> <li>b. Donor income increases from US\$ 150,000 to US\$ 300,000</li> <li>c. Own income increases from US\$ 10,000 to US\$ 100,000</li> </ul>
	Number of endemic and threatened species effectively conserved in formally gazetted FNRs change from:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Site level endemics increases from 129 to 195</li> <li>b. Threatened animals increase from 12 to 34</li> </ul>
Component 1: Consolidating and improving the management of the FNR network	Extent (km) of boundaries adequately demarcated and routinely maintained in the six targeted FNRs increase from ~210Km to 661km
	Number of the targeted FNRs with all entry points adequately signposted and secured increase from 0 to 6
	Number of ranger staff in the six targeted FNRs who are adequately equipped and sustained increase from 0 to 60
	Number of the targeted FNRs with functional basic transport and infrastructure (i.e. minimum of 2 operational vehicles, 4 operational motorbikes, one administrative office and 3 functional ranger outposts) increase from 2 to 6
	Extent (km) of footpaths and roads in the six targeted FNRs under routine maintenance (clearing, steps, drainage, signage): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Roads: increase from ~17km to 158km</li> <li>a. Footpaths increase from ~34km to 230km</li> </ul>
	Number of targeted FNRs with signed MOUs with all affected villages, and an operating joint co-management structure increase from 0 to 6
	Value (US\$) of funding raised in support of the development and implementation of community-based livelihood opportunities for villages with signed MOUs with the six targeted FNRs <US\$10,000/annum to >US\$100,000/annum
	Number of FNR and TFS-support staff completing technical, conservation, enforcement, communications and tourism skills development courses and training programmes increase from none to 40
	Number of FNR working forum meetings/annum increase from 0 to 4
	Component 2: Strengthening the financial sustainability of the FNR network
Number of nature-based tourism and/or recreational concessions/leases awarded and under development in FNRs consider state of the art ventures e.g. cableway, forest canopy boardwalk and tree top accommodation increase from 0 to 2	
Income/annum (US\$) to FNRs from nature-based tourism concessions/leases increase from US\$ 0 to US\$ 10,000	
Number of individuals from FNR-adjacent villages benefiting directly from tourism concessions/leases (construction and/or operational phases) increase from 0 to >100	
Number of visitors/annum to FNRs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Day: increase from &lt;2000 to &gt; 5,000</li> <li>b. Overnight: increase from &lt;300 to &gt;500</li> </ul>	
Number of, and income (US\$/annum) from, <u>joint venture</u> bee and butterfly farms in FNRs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Number: increase from 0 to &gt;4</li> <li>b. Income (US\$/annum): increase from 0 to &gt;US\$50,000</li> </ul>	
Financial plan for FNR network completed and being used	
Additional ring-fenced income (US\$/annum) raised from new/additional donor sources for FNR development and management increase from none to >US\$300,000	

## 4.2 PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS – HIGHLY SATISFACTORY

72. From the PIR reviews produced between 2015 and 2016 and the latest PIR (2017) presented and endorsed by the PSC, the project has delivered fully on 18 out of 25 end of project targets, registering a 72% delivery. The MTR finds that the project is on track to deliver on the remaining seven indicators. Notable achievements include gazettement of 6 new FNRs (one more than the end of project target), formulation of the tourism development strategy for all the six new FNRs, approximately 75% completion of construction of all the offices and Ranger Posts, completion of roads, footpaths and boundary marking and clearing, and completion of JFMPs for all the 6 new FNRs. The MTR finds that the following factors contributed to the high delivery: a) Clear design of a single focal area project, with a clear and simple project implementation strategy and SMART



indicators; b) The implementation strategy adopted by the project with the Project Team focusing exclusively on the project implementation. The members of the Project Team are dedicated and worked hard to integrate project interventions with the co-finance and other partner institutions; c) Support of the Technical Advisor (part time); d) Timeliness of an issue – the project build on decades of work on FNRs and conservation of the Eastern Arc Mountains. This ensured a high level of both preparedness and government/political support for the project interventions. It also meant that there were many institutions and organisations interested and relevant to the agenda of the FNRs, upon which the project has very successfully build, demonstrated by the realization of substantial co-finance.

**Table 7: Progress towards Results Matrix**

Indicator	Baseline (2012/2013)	Target/s (End of Project)	Status by MTR date	Achievement rating	Justification for the Rating	Source of verification
<b>Project Objective:</b> To expand, financially secure and strengthen the management of Tanzania's Forest Nature Reserve network in response to the threats to biodiversity						
Number and extent (ha) of formally gazetted FNRs	5 NRs, 186,883 ha	(11) 12 NRs 302,982 ha	12 NRs 313,059.26 ha		All six targeted NR gazetted	Government Notice of declaration
Financial sustainability scorecard for FNR network	21%	35%	51%			Project review of Financial Sustainability Scorecard
Capacity development indicator score for TFS	Systemic: 59% Institutional: 50% Individual: 55%	Systemic: 62% Institutional: 58% Individual: 62%	Systemic: 62% Institutional: 58% Individual: 62%		All Conservators have attended training on governance, accountability	Project review of Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard
Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool scorecard (average) All FNRs Existing FNRs (6) Proposed/New FNRs (5)	All FNRs: 38% Existing FNRs: 42% Proposed FNRs: 33%	All FNRs: >51% Existing FNRs: >52% Proposed FNRs: >48%	All FNRs averaged METT - 64%		METT updated routinely for all NRs	Project review of METT scorecard (every two years)
Income/annum (US\$), by source, from: TFS budget Donor income Own income	TFS budget: US\$1,763,000 Donor income: US\$150,000 Own income: <US\$10,000	TFS budget: >US\$2,500,000 Donor income: >US\$300,000 Own income: >US\$100,000	Progress made		Substantive contribution from TFS – purchase of 7 vehicles, motorcycles for all NRs, staff salaries Partners support for IGAs, JFM Agreements	TFS annual report and financial audit
Number of endemic and threatened species effectively conserved in formally gazetted FNRs	Site level endemics: 129 Threatened animals: 12	Site level endemics: >195 Threatened animals: >34	12 NRs management secured		All the 12 NRs are secured	Research and monitoring data/reports
<b>Outcome 1</b> Consolidating and improving the management of the FNR network						
<b>Outputs:</b>						
1.1: The conservation status and boundaries of six FNRs are secured						
1.2: The core staffing complement, infrastructure and equipment of six FNRs is in place						
1.3 The governance of, and benefit sharing in, six FNRs is strengthened						
The capacity of TFS to plan and manage the six RNRs as part of a wider network of FNRs improved						
Number of active Reserve Management Plans in the six targeted FNRs	0 (4 outdated) Chome, Magamba Mkingu and Rungwe, Uzungwa and Minziro	6 NRs	6 new and 12 in total		All six NR have updated/new management plans	Reserve Management Plans FNR quarterly/annual reports Project reports
Extent (km) of boundaries adequately	~210km	661km	> 661 km		Boundaries annually cleared	FNR quarterly/annual reports

Indicator	Baseline (2012/2013)	Target/s (End of Project)	Status by MTR date	Achievement rating	Justification for the Rating	Source of verification
demarcated and routinely maintained in the six targeted FNRs						Project reports
Number of the targeted FNRs with all entry points adequately signposted and secured	0	6	6		Signboard in place,	FNR quarterly/annual reports Project reports
Number of ranger staff in the six targeted FNRs who are adequately equipped and sustained	0	60	50 (60)		Staff turnover within TFS, Some NR have staff with lower qualifications	FNR quarterly/annual reports Project reports
Number of the targeted FNRs with functional basic transport and infrastructure (i.e. minimum of 2 operational vehicles, 4 operational motorbikes, one administrative office and 3 functional ranger outposts).	2 (but not fully functional)	6	6		Each FNR has a car and a motorcycle	FNR quarterly/annual reports Project reports
Extent (km) of footpaths and roads in the six targeted FNRs under routine maintenance	Roads: ~17km Footpaths: ~34km	Roads: 158km Footpaths: 230km	>158 km > 230km		All NR have footpaths to critical sites	FNR quarterly/annual reports Project reports
Number of targeted FNRs with signed MOUs with all affected villages, and an operating joint co-management structure.	0	6	6		JFM Agreements in place but some are yet to be signed	MOU's signed FNR quarterly/annual reports Project reports Village level bylaws
Value (US\$) of funding raised in support of the development and implementation of community-based livelihood opportunities for villages with signed MOUs with the six targeted FNRs	<US\$10,000/annum	>US\$100,000/annum	USD 100,000 (EU, ACOSIA, WCS, EAMCEF, Friends of Usambara)		Level of funding from partners not transparently shared	FNR quarterly/annual reports Project reports
Number of FNR and TFS-support staff completing technical, conservation, enforcement, communications and tourism skills development courses and training programmes	N/A	40	35		Trainings undertaken for all Conservators including exchange and learning visits to related organizations (TANAPA, NCAA)	FNR quarterly/annual reports TFS Annual Report Project reports
Number of FNR working forum meetings/annum	0	4	4		Annual meetings held with all implementing partners to share progress and lessons	FNR quarterly/annual reports Project reports

Indicator	Baseline (2012/2013)	Target/s (End of Project)	Status by MTR date	Achievement rating	Justification for the Rating	Source of verification
<b>Outcome 2: Strengthening the financial sustainability of the FNR network</b>						
<b>Outputs</b>						
2.1: The commercial development of tourism and recreational facilities and services in FNRs is implemented through PPP						
2.2: The destinations, attractions, facilities and services in FNRs are effectively marketed to target audiences						
2.3: Other income-generating activities in targeted FNRs are identified and tested						
Number of subsidiary FNR Tourism Development Plans	0	11 (12)	12		Tourism plans developed by TFS and partners	Tourism Development Plans, FNR Quarterly/Annual reports Project reports
Number of nature-based tourism and/or recreational concessions/leases awarded and under development in FNRs consider state of the art ventures e.g. cableway, forest canopy boardwalk and tree top accommodation	0	2	2			Concession/ lease agreements TFS Annual Report
Income/annum (US\$) to FNRs from nature-based tourism concessions/ leases	US\$0	>US\$10,000	>USD 10,000		Concessions/leases are yet to be operational	TFS Annual Report and Financial Audit
Number of individuals from FNR-adjacent villages benefiting directly from tourism concessions/leases (construction and/or operational phases)	0	>100	>100		Concessions/leases are yet to be operational	Project Reports Concessionaire reports FNR quarterly/annual reports
Number of visitors/annum to FNRs	Day: <2,000 Overnight: <300	Day: >5,000 Overnight: >500	Day: >5,000 Overnight: >500		The number of visitors has increased in all NRs	FNR Quarterly/Annual reports TFS Annual Report
Number of, and income (US\$/annum) from, joint venture beekeeping and butterfly farms in FNRs	Number: 0 Income (US\$/annum): 0	Number: >4 Income (US\$/annum): >US\$50,000	Supported IGAs: Beekeeping Butterfly farming Fish farming. Conservation agriculture. Income not quantified yet			Farm operator annual and financial reports FNR Quarterly/Annual reports TFS Annual Report and Financial Audit Project Reports
Financial plan for FNR network	0	1	Tendered			Financial Plan Project reports
Additional ring-fenced income (US\$/annum) raised from new/additional donor sources for FNR development and management	N/A	>US\$300,000	Additional funding realized not quantified but exceeds target – mainly WWF, WCS, AV Jensen, EAMCEF, EU, CEPF, Friends of Usambara		Substantive funding raised and used to support direct/complementary activities	TFS Annual Report and Financial Audit Project Reports
Green= Achieved		Yellow= On target to be achieved		Red= Not on target to be achieved		

### **4.3 REMAINING BARRIERS TO ACHIEVING THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE**

73. The project design identified barriers related to ineffective institutions responsible for the efficient and cost-effective management of the network of FNRs; and individual FNRs within the network of FNRs that are sufficiently staffed, adequately resourced and sustainably funded to achieve their defined management. The MTR notes progress in capacity building including placement and training of staff in all the FNRs networks. It also notes increase in funding from the budgetary processes, since FNR financing is now mainstreamed into the TFS budget allocation. The MTR however finds that staff turnover through regular transfers and inability of the TFS to fill all key positions presents a barrier to having an effective network of NRs. It also finds that despite the inclusion into the budgetary processes, the management of the FNRs is still largely dependent on co-finance from local and international partners; and that availability of these co-funds are beyond the influence of the project. Most of the NRs were gazetted recently and are not yet generating revenues to support their effective management (including revenues for communities under the Joint Forest Management Plans). These two combined, present a barrier towards to financial sustainability.

### **4.4 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT - SATISFACTORY**

#### **4.4.1 WORK PLANNING - SATISFACTORY**

74. Despite the slight delay between project approval and Inception Workshop, project implementation is well under way with impressive progress in delivery of both outputs and progress towards end of project targets.
75. From the Project progress reports (PIR), the MTR finds that the project implementation is in line with the implementation schedule for most outputs and activities as indicated in the dashboard presented and endorsed by the PSC on the April 6 2018. The field visits made in Magamba, Chome, Mkingu and Mt. Rungwe NRs confirmed the progress reported in the PIRs mainly in the development of JFMs and the infrastructure development (NR HQs, ranger posts, nature trails and signage). The MTR finds that implementation of the workplans has been successful in the following main areas; 1) working with partners (TFCG, WCS, EAMCEF,) to facilitate relevant activities in respective NRs; 2) co-financing from the main partners (EU, WCS, EAMCEF and TFS); 3) Mainstreaming of project plans in the TFS annual workplans through respective zonal offices; 4) implementation of activities using established government structures and staff; and, 5) incorporation in the project workplans, community based IGAs.

#### ***Delays in project implementation***

76. The MTR noted a slight delay in the signing of JFM Agreements to allow for their operationalization. The delays were mainly due to the approval process: where the district councils have planned to discuss and provide approval at the scheduled Full Council meetings, to take place between April and June 2018. The MTR however, sees no major cause for concern as most agreements were planned to be signed during the April-June quarter.

#### ***Adaptive management - Satisfactory***

77. The MTR finds that the project has not faced many challenges requiring application of adaptive management. In general, implementation of project activities has proactively engaged the respective District Councils through the implementing partners such as the TFCG in Mvomero (Mkingu NR) to fast track the endorsement of the Agreements. TFS opted to buy land from communities for two Rangers Posts rather than place them within the Nature Reserves, to secure ecological integrity of the reserves. In addition, the UNDP engaged the Minister for Natural Resources and Tourism to ensure that the Project Coordinator was exempted from a mandatory

internal transfer within TFS. This has ensured continuity in project coordination and contributed significantly to the excellent progress on delivery of outputs and results registered to date.

#### ***Use of the Results Framework as a management tool - Satisfactory***

78. The MTR finds that project implementation is guided by the Multi-Year work plan which is complemented by detailed Quarterly plans prepared by the Project Team, endorsed by the PSC and finally approved by UNDP. The project strategy (objective, outcomes, outputs and activities) were reviewed and endorsed during the project Inception Workshop held in September 2015. The MTR noted however that the planned budget was not changed/updated despite the delay in project start-up date. The MTR finds that the M&E plan was reviewed and the indicators updated mainly the baselines and is being used to monitor implementation progress.

79. From the project workplans and PIR reviewed and also the project Dashboard, the MTR finds that workplans are being developed based on the Projects Results Framework provided in the ProDoc and as updated during the Inception Workshop. The Results framework is being used to prepare annual workplans that are endorsed by the PSC and subsequently the UNDP CO and Regional GEF Unit.

#### **4.4.2 FINANCE AND CO-FINANCE – HIGHLY SATISFACTORY**

##### ***Level of expenditure***

80. As of MTR, overall expenditure for the project was 67.69%. The highest expenditure was on Outcome 1 (Table 8). This achievement is explained by the reality that most expenditures on this Outcome are related to procurement of facilities and the construction of office buildings and ranger posts for the six NRs.

**Table 8: Project Expenditure from its Commencement to 18-03-2018**

BUDGET		ANNUAL EXPENDITURE				BALANCE OF FUNDS		
Project Outcomes	Budget In Project Document	Year 2015	Year 2016	Year 2017	Year 2018	Total Expenditure - As at 18-03-2018	Total Balance - As 18-03-2018	% Expenditure Vs Budget
GEF, GOVT CS & TRAC	GEF, GOVT CS & TRAC	GEF, GOVT CS & TRAC	GEF, GOVT CS & TRAC	GEF, GOVT CS & TRAC	GEF, GOVT CS & TRAC	GEF, GOVT CS & TRAC	GEF, GOVT CS & TRAC	GEF, GOVT CS & TRAC
Outcome 1	3,499,437.00	324,322.76	1,265,870.24	1,015,965.71	244,044.27	2,850,202.98	649,234.02	81.45
Outcome 2	1,842,000.00	78,855.99	250,017.34	542,848.75	4,658.61	876,380.69	965,619.31	47.58
Outcome 3	418,000.00	14,345.80	56,894.69	73,66.80	612.45	145,459.74	272,540.26	34.80
<i>Commitment</i>					<i>26,825.00</i>	<i>26,825.00</i>	<i>(26,825.00)</i>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5,759,437.00</b>	<b>417,524.55</b>	<b>1,572,782.27</b>	<b>1,632,421.26</b>	<b>276,140.33</b>	<b>3,898,868.41</b>	<b>1,887,393.59</b>	<b>67.70</b>

81. This expenditure for Outcome 1 has surpassed the annual disbursements planned in the project budget.

82. UNDP CO sees the good progress made and sees the justification of early calling for funds for 2019 to cover payments that will emanate from this overachievement. This need was also endorsed by the 8<sup>th</sup> PSC held on the 6<sup>th</sup> April 2018.

83. Implementation of complementary activities by partners reduced the costs that would have required engaging service providers through direct use of own resources. Also TFS contributed to the project through payment of staff salaries and routine provision of operational budgets for the NRs. Implementation of community activities such as forest patrols were done by communities with no financial support from the project. The MTR records these as examples of cost effectiveness strategies adapted by the project.

84. The project implementation has provided for spending flexibility for earlier unplanned activities with approval of the PSC and UNDP.

**Financial controls**

85. The review of disbursements and reporting being based on sound financial management systems both from UNDP CO and the TFS financial management system. The MTR finds that the project working through the government and the UNDP systems has good financial controls. These include existence of mechanisms for disbursement based on accurately reported expenditures through FACE, expenditures made based on approved thresholds. TFS and UNDP have annual internal audits conducted.

**Co-financing**

86. The total costs of investment as indicated in the ProDoc is estimated at US\$ 23,700,000 of which US\$ 4,100,000 constitutes grant funding from GEF and US\$19,600,000 comprises co-financing.

87. The MTR notes that the project partners committed substantive co-finance for direct and complementary activities. The MTR finds evidence that the partners in the co-financing arrangement implemented respective activities directly or in collaboration with the project team and Conservators. From the Financial reports and Minutes of the PSC meetings, the co-finance adds up to 52.8% of the committed funding (Table 9). For some partners, the funding is the sum of costs incurred to implement respective activities including operations and staff salaries.

**Table 9: State of Co-Finance Summary at MTR**

Source of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount endorsement (US\$)	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
Government of Tanzania	TFS	In kind – salaries and operations	15,000,000.00	6,250,000.00	41.7
Government of Tanzania	TFS	Own income	300,000.00	200,000.00	66.7
EU	TFCG	In kind	1,800,000.00	1,440,000.00	80.0
USAID	WCS	In kind	400,000.00	200,000.00	50.0
NGO	WWF	In kind	400,000.00	400,000.00	100.0
	UNDP	Grant - Trac	1,000,000.00	149,617.56	15.0
	EAMCEF/Friends of Usambara	Grants to Eastern Arc Mts NRs	700,000.00	714,285.71	102.0
GEF	UNDP	Grant	4,100,000.00	3,161,013.66	77.1
Total			23,700,000.00	12,514,916.93	52.8

88. Significant co-finance has been delivered by TFS that covered the purchase of vehicles and motorcycles, salaries for staff and operational budget for all nature reserves. The other significant contribution is from TFCG who through EU facilitate complementary activities in Mkingu and Chome Nature reserves. Again most of the funding was to cover field operations and staff costs.

89. MTR also finds significant co-finance has been provided by TFS as the main implementing partner. Other partners include WCS (Chome and Mkingu NFR), EAMCEF (for the NRs in the Eastern Arc Mountains), and WCS (Mt Rungwe NR). While significant work has been noted through partners co-finance, exact contributions have not been documented. The MTR finds significant financial or socio-economics risks to sustainability based on the low incomes from the NRs and direct/tangential benefits including revenue sharing with villages

90. Some contributions were also provided by EAMCEF, ACOSIA and Friends of Usambara to support development of bylaws and JFM agreements.
91. Despite the fact the overall co-financing was above 50%, own contributions are still low as these are based on revenue collections that are still low.
92. Contributions from the private sector have not been established notably because private sector investments in the tourism activities and the related value chain have not been developed.

#### **4.4.3 PROJECT-LEVEL MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS – HIGHLY SATISFACTORY**

93. Project monitoring is being done using a Project M&E Plan that was developed in the course of the first year of implementation. The M&E plan was based on the project logframe and the indicators in the Project Resource Framework, which met the SMART criteria. The MTR finds that the M&E plan simplified the project, providing a step by step analysis of the sequenced implementation for each component, making it easy for the TFS staff to understand the whole project. It also provided data collection tools, composed of a set of templates (forms) to collect and compile the information at each landscape. The templates standardized data recording, storage and aggregation, ensuring high quality data throughout the NFRs and the project. Finally it outlines the roles and responsibilities of the various partners in the monitoring and evaluation process, ensuring separation of duties and effective monitoring and utilization of the monitoring information in adaptive management. The MTR finds that the M&E plan has informed project management and the PSC about progress, and that its information has been utilized in the annual work plans and project reports (quarterly and PIR). Monitoring itself is undertaken primarily via visits to the project sites by the PSC, Project Team and UNDP.

#### **4.4.4 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT**

##### ***Leveraging partnerships with stakeholders***

94. MTR noted significant participation of NGOs in project delivery - namely TFCG (Mkingu and Chome), Friends of Usambara, WCS and AWF (Mt Rungwe NR), and the EAMCEF for the eight NRs within the Eastern Arc Mountains NRs namely Chome, Magamba, Nilo, Amani, Mkingu, Uluguru, Kilombero and Uzungwa Scarp).
95. The LGAs are actively involved in the development of JFM agreements and bylaws. Communities have formed VNRCs and Forest Management Committees at village level and have voluntarily participated in routine patrols.

##### ***Active role in project decision-making***

96. A Project Steering Committee (PSC) provides overall policy guidance to the project. The PSC is constituted to serve as the executive decision-making body for the project and ensuring that the project remains on course to deliver the desired outcomes. The Composition of the PSC includes representation from MNRT (Policy & Planning), Vice President Office Division of Environment (GEF Operational Focal Point), (VPO-DoE), UNDP and President's Office, Regional Administration and Local Government (PO -RALG). Other members of the PSC include representation of each Forest Nature Reserve by the economic and productive sectors from Mbeya, Iringa, Morogoro, Kagera, Tanga, and Kilimanjaro & Lindi regions. Representatives from the National Environment Management Council, Private Sector, Tanzania Forest Conservation Group, World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF TCO), and the Forest and Beekeeping Division (FBD) are also included in the PSC.

##### ***Stakeholder involvement and public awareness***

97. The MTR finds that JFM agreements and bylaws were developed for the villages adjacent to the 12 NRs. The process involved engaging the village assembly to endorse them, ward councils to

review and endorse Full District Council to approve and TFS. Some were facilitated by partners including TFCG (Mkingu and Chome NRs), WCS (Mt Rungwe NR). Similar active participation was noted in the development of VLUPs and establishment of VNRC. MNRT and FBD facilitated gazettelement of the 6 NRs.

98. The MTR finds that the project and its partners have widely publicised the FNRs network, using their biodiversity richness, potential contribution to the economy (local and national) and water catchment services as selling points. Under water catchment services, the messages have emphasized FNRs contribution to increasing water availability for hydropower generation, irrigation and domestic use, in rural and urban settlements. The project has therefore made efforts to engage partners and recognize their participation. The MTR noted the wide representation of key stakeholders in the PCU for the necessary oversight and strategic engagement in its implementation. The MTR find that this has created the necessary commitment.

#### **4.4.5 REPORTING**

##### ***Adaptive management***

99. A Project Steering Committee (PSC) provides overall policy guidance to the project and serve as the executive decision making body for the project. The PSC receives and approves Annual Work Plans (AWP) for onward clearance by UNDP CO and y the GEF Regional Coordinating Unit (RCU) and UNDP/GEF Unit. Changes to the project activities, implementation strategy and budgets are endorsed by the PSC.
100. The Inception Workshop that was run back-to-back with the first PSC addressed a number of key issues including Assisting partners to understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and the UNDP-GEF Regional Office and the project team were reviewed and approved. The PSC also discussed the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines. Also reviewed the monitoring framework and updated the indicators, targets and means of verification, and assumptions and risks based on the project results framework and the GEF Tracking Tool and also the reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements and Monitoring and Evaluation work plan.

##### ***Understanding of UNDP reporting requirements***

101. The project team has reported routinely to UNDP through Quarterly Progress Reports (QPR) indicating progress made toward project objective and project outcomes with respect to indicators, baseline data and cumulative targets. The do reflect on outputs delivered for the respective outcome in the Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements that captures lesson learned/good practice, AWP and other expenditure reports, Risk and adaptive management
102. The MTR also finds that the PC has maintained accountability on the quality, timeliness and effectiveness of the activities carried out, as well as for the use of funds through regular delivery of quarterly operational reports and Annual Progress Reports (APR/PIR) and FACE reports as per the GEF and UNDP requirements and standards.

##### ***Documentation and sharing of Lessons learned***

103. Lessons learned are documented as part of the Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR). The reports that include the lessons captures are presented to the PSC that include the key partners. The reports are widely shared with partners and also publicly made available through the project website



#### **4.4.6 COMMUNICATION**

104. The MTR finds that the project has an active website where all relevant documents are uploaded regularly (<http://www.nature-reserves.go.tz>). However, the UNDP and GEF logos are being used incorrectly on the website, contravening compliance with UNDP's and GEF's Branding Guidelines. In addition, the MTR finds that the implementing agency and project partners have implemented substantial promotion related activities and training in all levels from national to local levels including newsletters, journals, calendars and signboards that carry promotional as well as forest management messages. The MTR finds the awareness and promotion made have contributed to effective participation of key players at all levels. This has also contributed to the fundraising initiatives.
105. The Project Team including Conservators routinely use the social media to share progress and lessons/best practices. The MTR however finds that other than the website, there has not been a formal forum for the technical teams and stakeholders to discuss technical issues of FNRs, share progress and best practices. Although all the Conservators responsible for the FNRs attend the PSC meetings, these PSC focuses on project policy, review of project progress and other project implementation issues. The MTR finds that there is a need for additional forums, focused on technical discussions. This is more so noting that the NRs are under different stages of management ranging from the initial ones (Amani NR) followed by the next bath (Nilo, Uluguru, Kilombero) and the more recent ones.
106. However, the MTR finds that the project has demonstrated several best practices and generated several lessons that it has not effectively shared nationally or internationally. As outlined in the recommendations section, the project has exceeded the target on gazettement FNRs; an unusual achievement for many ordinary projects, and one that can probably be attributed to perfect timing and political commitment. It used a unique project coordination arrangement that proved efficient and effective; it has a network of FNR managers who could be exchanging ideas. Although these achievements are reported in the project reports such as the PIR, they should be synthesized and communicated widely to national, regional and global audiences. These achievements should be used to sell the FNRs widely to promote mobilization of funds from the private sector, foundations and bilateral donors, at the national and international levels.

#### ***Key stakeholders left out of communication***

107. The Tanzania Tourism Board (TTB) has been identified as a key stakeholder in the utilization of the FNRs as a tourism product. However, the MTR found no evidence of their engagement especially in the development of the tourism investment plans and marketing strategies for the NRs. They are not a member of the PSC. TTB needs to be brought on board, especially given the struggle to increase ecotourism and visitor numbers for revenue generation, and further noting that tourism development and marketing is not a core business of TFS. Although the private sector is recognized and included as members of the PSC, the MTR is of the view that the pace of development of the tourism business is too slow. The MTR recommends that, in addition to the two concessions concluded, the project identifies additional potential private sector partners to develop FNR friendly tourism products. This could be assisted by TTB as part of the project marketing and promotion strategy of the tourism products and services in FNRs.

### **4.5 SUSTAINABILITY - UNLIKELY**

#### **4.5.1 FINANCIAL RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY - SIGNIFICANT**

108. Component two of the project is focused on enhancing the financial sustainability of the entire network of 13 FNRs to ensure that they incrementally develop the capacity (over the longer-term) to generate adequate financial resources to cover the full costs of their management. The project uses three strategies to advance financial sustainability: (i) facilitating public-private partnerships in the commercial development of tourism and recreational facilities and services in FNRs; (ii)

marketing the destinations, attractions, facilities and services of FNRs and (iii) implementing other income-generating activities in targeted FNRs. The project has registered significant achievements on component 2: the 12 subsidiary FNR tourism development plans are ready; the two concessions have been issued and combined, the NRs are registering more than US 10,000 per year from tourism with visitor numbers exceeding five thousand (all the foregoing financed by the project); additional ring-fenced financial resources exceed 300,000 (mainly from co-finance institutions); and, income generating activities have raised more than US\$ 50,000 for communities (largely supported by co-finance institutions). Despite these impressive achievements, the MTR finds that financial risk to sustainability is significant for the following reasons: a). the Project Baseline reports estimated that the total funding requirements to support the basic operational management of 10 of the 11 FNRs (excluding Magamba, for which data was not yet available) over the five-year time frame of the project was TZS 36.1 billion (US\$ 16 million<sup>9</sup>), of which TZS 28.7 billion (US\$ 12.8 million) (~80%) represents the financing gap. This translates to annual cost of US\$ 3.2 million and a financing gap of US\$ 2.55 million. Although the financing of the FNRs have been mainstreamed in the national budget, these are still substantial sums of money compared to the secured finances.

109. Although the project has produced FNR tourism development plans and the two concessions have been issued, there is very limited tourism development in the FNRs. Although tourism numbers are increasing, they are still too few to make significant changes in revenue generation.

#### **4.5.2 SOCIO-ECONOMICS RISK TO SUSTAINABILITY – SIGNIFICANT**

110. The drivers of deforestation and forest degradation in Tanzania are related to the socio-economics context of the country's population; a high and growing population with economies and livelihoods that are highly dependent on natural resources. Community participation in forest management is critical to reducing threats and reversing forest loss in a country where the resources for enforcement without communities would fat out way what is available to the government and its partners (see the finance gap described above). Fortunately, the country has, over several decades, established the institutional and legal environment for community based natural resources management. The project used the establishment of Joint Forest Management Plans to systematically engage communities living around the FNRs, ensuring that they derive ecosystems benefits and financial/development benefits from forest conservation. Although the project exceeded the end of year target on the number of Joint Forest Management Plans formulated, the MTR finds that the socio-economics risk to the project results are significant, with the reasons explained below.

111. The comprehensive and systematic implementation of the Joint Forest Management Plans has not started; currently implementation is opportunistic and depends on availability of co-finance institutions. Although several of the JFMPs are yet to be approved, it is unclear whether the project is set up with the resources and technical capacity to facilitate the implementation of these plans. In addition, even if systematic implementation were to begin, the JFMPs are unlikely to make significant shift to the baseline socio-economics drivers of forest loss. The project document recognized that underlying the regular threats to forests<sup>10</sup> are deeper social, political and economic issues including an increasing demand for agricultural and timber products, endemic poverty, weak governance, marginalization of rural communities and women, weak land tenure, and low levels of political will to conserve forests. Many of the communities living adjacent to these forests are amongst the poorest in Tanzania. High rates of poverty within these communities mean that there is a high dependency on natural resources to meet food, fuel and shelter requirements. In the context of a growing population, a widening division between rich and poor and growing threats from climate change, these issues are liable to result in increasing rates of deforestation, irreversible biodiversity loss and deeper poverty for forest adjacent communities, particularly women.

---

<sup>9</sup> Using exchange rate of 2,250 Tsh to one US Dollar.

<sup>10</sup> Unsustainable harvesting of forest resources, encroachment and conversion to agriculture, invasive species, mining, etc.

112. Indeed, the project document reported that although the country had (by 2014) over 5.3 million hectares covered under JFM in nearly 1000 villages, the evidence that it results in improved forest condition appears to be mixed. Research carried out to date would indicate that in some areas JFM appears to be working as an effective management tool with which to restore and sustain forest condition while in others it appears to be little better than when managed exclusively by the state.

113. Finally, the government has introduced a change in government revenue management policy. All government institutions are required to remit all revenues to the central treasury for redistribution through the budget process. If an exemption is not granted, this process is likely to increase transaction costs and bureaucratic processes of remitting community share of the revenues from eco-tourism. Although the Project Management confirmed that the Amani Nature Reserve has obtained an exemption to this rule, it is yet to be spread to the other FNRs. In addition, there is no guarantee that all the revenue generated from the FNRs will be returned for reinvestment into their management.

#### **4.5.3 INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND GOVERNANCE RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY – INSIGNIFICANT**

114. Tanzania has established a robust institutional framework for forest management that will most likely sustain the project results (if the financial and socio-economics risks to sustainability are addressed). In particular, the *Land Act* (1999) and the *Village Land Act* (1999) empower village governments with the devolution of management rights over land. It enables villages to draft and enforce bylaws<sup>11</sup>. It allows for the creation of Certificates of Village Land and the Right of Occupancy to Forest Land for both communities and individuals. Finally, it establishes management institutions for Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) and Community-Based Forestry (CBF) at village level (like Village Assembly, Village Council, Village Environment Committee, Village Natural Resource Management Committee and Village scouts or guards). The Act makes legal provision for common property to be registered as statutory entitlements in Customary Lands.

115. Many other institutions cater for forest management and will ensure sustainability of results. In particular, The *Tanzania Forest Service* (TFS) Agency is an executive agency (in terms of the Executive Agencies Act Cap 245, through the Establishment Order GN 269 of July 2010) that is mandated with the establishment and management of national Forest Reserves (both natural and plantations), bee reserves and forest and bee resources on reserved land. According to the Establishment Order, TFS owns all central government forest reserves (including mangrove forests, nature reserves, catchment forests, coastal forests, productive forest reserves and proposed bee reserves), an area of ~15 million ha. In addition, the *Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism* (MNRT) has the responsibility for overseeing the management of all natural, cultural and tourism resources in Tanzania. The *Forest and Beekeeping Division* (FBD) within the MNRT is in turn directly responsible for the development of forest policy, laws and regulations and supervising their implementation in the forestry sector.

#### **4.5.4 ENVIRONMENTAL RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY - INSIGNIFICANT**

116. The impacts of climate change are the most significant environmental factor likely to affect the sustainability of the project results. The Project Document reported that the main consequences of climate change are a rise in the mean daily temperature (on average, by 3 - 5°C throughout the country), a rise in the mean annual temperature (on average by 2 - 4°C), an increase in rainfall in some parts of the country, and decreased rainfall in others. Some areas of northern Tanzania will get wetter (between 5 - 45% wetter), whilst others, especially in the south, will experience severe reductions in rainfall (up to 10%). This change in rainfall would make the central, western and southern part of the country increasingly unsuitable for agricultural production<sup>12</sup>. Climate change

---

<sup>11</sup> But not to collect fines.

<sup>12</sup> For example, it is estimated that the projected temperature and rainfall changes could decrease the average annual maize yield by 33% and the cotton and coffee yields by up to 20%.

projections also indicate that the frequency and severity of extreme climatic events (especially the incidence of droughts and floods) will increase. The latter was confirmed by respondents to the MTR. Irregular seasons are likely to affect food production and increase the intensity of the socio-economic underlying drivers of deforestation described in the sections above. Unusually high rainfall in March this year has already destroyed the limited infrastructure in the FNRs and delayed completion of the offices and Ranger Posts. Forest responses to climate change are however uncertain, with predictions that highly fragmented forest or species populations will probably be more vulnerable to the effects of climate change.

## 5 Conclusions and Recommendations

### 5.1 CONCLUSIONS

117. The overall project performance is rated as Satisfactory. Based on the design of the project in relation to the threats and barriers, the project is relevant as it addresses national priorities on securing and strengthening management effectiveness of forest nature reserves' networks. The project complies with the GEF strategic objectives to 'Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems' and contributes to the Outcomes on '*Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas*'; and '*Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management*'.
118. The project has demonstrated good best practices and has generated several lessons including the speedy gazettement of FNRs and unique project coordination arrangement adopted that has proved to be efficient and effective. These need synthesis to be communicated widely to national, regional and global audiences for the purpose of promoting the FRNs and mobilization of funds. The Project strategy and implementation arrangements are built on national structures and systems that not only ensure ownership by implementing institutions (TFS and partners) but also reduces project overhead costs as applied conventionally in PMUs.
119. The project implementation draws a wide co-financing arrangements and partnerships from the main implementing agency, other government institutions, NGOs and development partners to support the FNRs network, which explains the significant achievements the project registered in the first half of the implementation period.
120. At 72% delivery on end of project targets, the project has recorded impressive progress towards results at output level; notable contributions towards the outcomes are the gazettement of 6 new FNRs (one more than the end of project target), formulation of the tourism development strategy for all the six new FNRs, approximately 75% completion of construction of all the offices and Ranger Posts, completion of roads, footpaths and boundary marking and clearing, and completion of JFMPs for all the 6 new FNRs. The implementation strategy adopted by the project including the governance structures contributes to this and provides best practice and lessons for future project management.
121. Sustainability of the project interventions hinges on guaranteed financial sustainability. While TFS demonstrates confidence for continued support in the management of the FNRs, the infancy of revenue generation from these reserves leaves the NRs management susceptible should TFS fail to sufficiently provide the needed financial resources.
122. The project did not have a gender action plan or gender disaggregated indicators. Most indicators adopted do not need to be disaggregated by gender due to the nature of the indicators themselves – e.g. kilometres of roads cleared, number of completed offices, etc. There are however relevant gender issues that affect the project. For example the nature of forestry sector is such that it is dominated by men; hence the forest Conservators are mainly men. This means the PSC is also dominated by men, as are decision-makers in the sector. Although the project is unlikely to change this structural dynamic, it should be aware of its impact on the gender marker

of the project. More importantly, formulation and implementation of the JFMPs should be guided by a gender action plan to ensure full capture of gender issues and that implementation is cognizant of, and delivers benefits equitably across all gender groups. Fortunately, the project has plans to design a project gender action plan, which no doubt, should capture these gender issues.

## **5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS**

123. The recommendations made from this MTR as summarized below are based on the findings and are meant to guide the management to take corrective actions to ensure the project remains on course and steers the project delivery towards expected outcomes. The recommendations include actions to follow up or reinforce the initial achievements from the project and proposals for future directions towards impacts. Table 10 summarises the recommendations based on the MTR findings with indicated timeframe that is subject to the Management Response.

*Table 10: Summary of recommendations (see the Executive Summary)*

## 6 Annexes

### 6.1 ANNEX 1: MTR ToR (EXCLUDING ToR ANNEXES)

#### *INTRODUCTION*

In accordance with the UNDP-GEF M&E policies and procedures, a Midterm Review (MTR) is due for the full-sized project “**Enhancing the Forest Nature Reserves Network for Biodiversity Conservation in Tanzania**” (PIMS 5106)” having reached mid-way since the start of its implementation. The project was designed to have a duration of five years project, with the Tanzania Forest Services Agency (TFS) as the main Implementing Partner. Other Responsible Partners include: Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT) and the Eastern Arc Mountains Conservation Endowment Fund (EAMCEF). The project document was signed on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2015 and the project is presently entering its third year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated after the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR) (August 2017). This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the MTR.

The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document: [\*Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects\*](#)

#### *PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION*

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) in collaboration with UNDP has committed US\$ 5.1 million to support strengthening the Nature Reserves network across Tanzania by implementing measures to gazette Nature Reserves and improve their effectiveness in addressing threats to biodiversity conservation, and hence provide for the long-term ecological, social and financial sustainability of that system. The focus is on 6 of 12 gazetted Nature Reserves, reflecting the fact that with some exceptions, the management effectiveness of Nature Reserves is sub-optimal relative to the Government’s desired levels, while tourism numbers to these reserves remain low and need to be increased.

#### *OBJECTIVES OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW (MTR)*

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project’s strategy, its risks to sustainability.

#### *4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY*

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team, comprised of an international and national expert, will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach<sup>13</sup> ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

---

<sup>13</sup> For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR<sup>14</sup>. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, academia, local government and CSOs and project stakeholders (TFS, MNRT, Conservators in each Nature Reserve, RAS in relevant regions, NGO partners helping with the management of the different Nature Reserves.)

Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to selected Nature Reserves site (Chome, Magamba, Minziro, Mkingu, Uzungwa and Rungwe – final list to be agreed during mission team briefing considering the accessibility of the sites during the visiting days) to review progress on the ground.

The team will be expected to work jointly to produce one single MTR report, describing the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

### ***DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR***

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. *See the Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

#### **Project Strategy**

##### Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

##### Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's Logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.

---

<sup>14</sup> For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

### Progress towards Results

#### Progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

#### *Progress towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)*

Project Strategy	Indicator <sup>15</sup>	Baseline Level <sup>16</sup>	Level in 1 <sup>st</sup> PIR (self-reported)	Mid-term Target <sup>17</sup>	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment <sup>18</sup>	Achievement Rating <sup>19</sup>	Justification for Rating
<b>Objective:</b>	Indicator (if applicable):							
<b>Outcome 1:</b>	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
<b>Outcome 2:</b>	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
<b>Etc.</b>								

#### **Indicator Assessment Key**

Green= Achieved

Yellow= On target to be achieved

Red= Not on target to be achieved

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

### Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

#### Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

<sup>15</sup> Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

<sup>16</sup> Populate with data from the Project Document

<sup>17</sup> If available

<sup>18</sup> Colour code this column only

<sup>19</sup> Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU



#### Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

#### Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

#### Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

#### Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

#### Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

#### Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?

- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

## **Sustainability**

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

### Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

### Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned to be documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

### Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

### Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

## **Conclusions & Recommendations**

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.<sup>20</sup>

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

---

<sup>20</sup> Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

## Ratings

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex C for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

### *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table*

<b>Measure</b>	<b>MTR Rating</b>	<b>Achievement Description</b>
<b>Project Strategy</b>	N/A	
<b>Progress Towards Results</b>	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
<b>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management</b>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<b>Sustainability</b>	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

### *TIMEFRAME*

The MTR will be undertaken between March and May 2018.  
Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

### *MIDTERM REVIEW JOINT DELIVERABLES*

<b>#</b>	<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Timing</b>	<b>Responsibilities</b>
1	<b>MTR Inception Report</b>	MTR team clarifies objectives, method and schedule for Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks from the MTR mission start date	MTR team submits to UNDP Country Office
2	<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of MTR in country mission	MTR Team presents to project management and UNDP Country Office
3	<b>Draft Report</b>	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission	Sent to the UNDP CO, reviewed by Technical Advisor, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP and other relevant parties.
4	<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to the UNDP Country Office and approved by the RTA and CO

### ***MTR IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS***

The principal responsibility for managing this review exercise resides with the UNDP CO in Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania in collaboration with TFS. The UNDP CO will contract the consultants and ensure the logistical arrangements are in place. The project team in Iringa will be responsible for logistical arrangements to the field visits. In consultation with the review team, PCU will assist in setting up stakeholder interviews; arrange field visits and consultation with leadership of all collaborating partners.

In preparation for the review mission, the Project Coordinator with assistance from the Technical Advisor and UNDP CO will arrange for the completion of the tracking tools (M&E, Financial and Capacity scorecards for mid-term stage). The tracking tools will be completed/endorsed by the relevant implementing agency or qualified national research /scientific institution, and not by the international consultant or UNDP staff. The tracking tools will be submitted to the mid-term review team for comment. These comments will be addressed by the project team, and the final version of the tracking tools will be attached as appendices to the Mid-term Review report. The Project team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR consultants to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

### ***TEAM COMPOSITION***

A team of two independent consultants will jointly conduct the MTR – a team leader (with international experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and a national expert with national experience on subject matter of this project. The international consultant will serve as overall Team Leader and be responsible for the final quality of report submitted to UNDP. The two consultants will form a team making a joint presentation at the end of in-country field visits and a joint final report at the end of the assignment. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

#### ***Competencies of the National Consultant***

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to conservation and Natural resources management
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 7 years;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Experience working in East Africa

#### ***Required Skills and Experience***

##### **Education**

- Master's degree in a relevant area such as Biodiversity Management, Protected Area development, Forest Conservation, Tourism development, Environmental sciences and Natural resources Management.
- Postgraduate diploma/certificate in Project Planning and Management is added advantage.

##### **Experience**

- 7 years relevant work experience in Biodiversity Management, Protected Area and Wildlife Conservation Management, Environmental sciences and Natural Resources Management., including Implementation at country and decentralized levels;
- Experience with natural resources and tourism policies in Tanzania with focus on eco-tourism will be an added advantage;

- Project development and design experience, experience in developing projects, specific experience in GEF project Monitoring and Evaluation and understanding will be an added advantage;
- Experience in and comfortable with working in different socio-cultural settings.
- Good understanding of National Policies guiding environmental management.

#### **Language**

- Fluent in written and spoken English
- Kiswahili will be added advantage

#### ***PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS***

- 10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report (**deliverable 1**)
- 30% upon submission of the draft MTR report (**deliverable 3**)
- 60% upon finalization of the MTR report and approved by the RTA and CO (**deliverable 4**)

## 6.2 ANNEX 2: MTR EVALUATIVE MATRIX (EVALUATION CRITERIA WITH KEY QUESTIONS, INDICATORS, SOURCES OF DATA, AND METHODOLOGY)

The table below outlines the questions that will guide the evaluation based on UNDP criteria.

Evaluation subject	Evaluation questions	Tools and methods
Project strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What challenges did the project seek to address?</li> <li>• What was the ToC used to identify and select components, outcomes, outputs and activities?</li> <li>• What are the underlying assumptions?</li> <li>• Have any of the risks and assumptions played out and what is the effect on implementation and achievement of results?</li> <li>• Were any assumptions incorrect or missed out entirely?</li> <li>• Have they played out and what is the effect on implementation and delivery of results?</li> <li>• Was the threat-root-cause barrier analysis comprehensive and on-target?</li> <li>• Have new threats and/or barriers emerged?</li> <li>• Is there room for adaptive management to tackle new threats, barriers?</li> <li>• Relevance: Are the issues/challenges being addressed by the project relevant to national development and livelihoods?</li> <li>• In which way are they relevant?</li> <li>• Are they government priority and if so where are these priorities stated?</li> <li>• What lessons were used to influence project design?</li> <li>• Have those lessons proven to be useful yet in project implementation?</li> <li>• <b>Decision-making processes:</b></li> <li>• Which groups are likely to be affected by the project, including benefitting from it?</li> <li>• Was project design done in a truly participator manner?</li> <li>• Was gender perspectives factored into project design and reflected in the participatory design process?</li> <li>• If not, why not and what has been the impact of this non participatory design process on implementation and project ownership?</li> <li>• Where is the evidence of participation by the relevant groups?</li> <li>• If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.</li> </ul>	<p>Review of project documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ (prodocs, Inception report, PIRs);</li> <li>➤ Minutes of project steering committee (Board) meetings;</li> <li>➤ Tracking tools</li> <li>➤ Technical publications;</li> <li>➤ Government policies/strategies on PAs, BD conservation;</li> </ul> <p>Focus group and individual interviews with relevant groups of stakeholders and key informants, respectively, using structured interview questionnaires;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ PCU</li> <li>➤ Members of the Project Board</li> </ul>
Results Framework /Log-frame	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?</li> <li>• Are the log-frame indicators and targets “SMART” and gender disaggregated?</li> <li>• Has progress made so far led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.</li> <li>• How are the catalysing effect of the project results being monitored?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Key informants in participating Ministries and Ministries responsible for various aspects of forest conservation;</li> <li>➤ TFS</li> </ul>
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the current project management arrangement?</li> <li>• What are the SWOT of the current project management arrangements?</li> <li>• Has it been effective?</li> <li>• Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear?</li> <li>• Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner?</li> <li>• Has the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) facilitated project</li> </ul>	

	<p>execution adequately?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the recommendations for improvement?</li> <li>• What lessons can be drawn from this arrangement?</li> <li>• Has the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) supported project execution effectively?</li> <li>• What are the key challenges of project execution?</li> <li>• What recommendations?</li> </ul>	
Work Planning:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is project implementation in line with the timeline set in the Prodoc?</li> <li>• If there were delays what caused them?</li> <li>• What is the likely implication of any delays on the rest of the project timeline?</li> <li>• Has adaptive management effectively resolved any issues of delays? If no, why not?</li> <li>• Are work-planning processes results-based?</li> <li>• Has the results framework/ log-frame been used as a management tool?</li> <li>• To what end? Has it worked well and if not why not?</li> <li>• What recommendations?</li> </ul>	<p>Review of project documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ (prodocs, Inception report, PIRs);</li> <li>➤ Minutes of project steering committee (Board) meetings;</li> <li>➤ Tracking tools</li> <li>➤ Technical publications;</li> <li>➤ Government policies/strategies on PA/BD conservation;</li> </ul>
Finance and co-finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the level of expenditure to-date?</li> <li>• Is this level in line with the original plans in the project budget?</li> <li>• If not, why have changes occurred? And what are the exact changes?</li> <li>• Have the appropriate approvals been sort and provided for these changes?</li> <li>• Has the project been cost effective and what criteria can we use to determine this?</li> <li>• Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?</li> <li>• Has the project mobilized extra funding?</li> <li>• Has it accessed any co-finance?</li> <li>• Is co-finance being monitored to confirm the expected situation at project design stage?</li> </ul>	<p>Focus group and individual interviews with relevant groups of stakeholders and key informants, respectively, using structured interview questionnaires;</p>
Project-level Monitoring and Review Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the project use an M&amp;E system?</li> <li>• Does it involve key partners in M&amp;E?</li> <li>• Is the M&amp;E linked to partner institutions' systems?</li> <li>• Does M&amp;E provide the necessary information efficiently/effectively?</li> <li>• Is it considered cost-effective?</li> <li>• Are additional tools required to make M&amp;E more participatory and inclusive?</li> <li>• Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and review?</li> <li>• Are these resources being allocated effectively?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ PCU</li> <li>➤ Members of the Project Board</li> <li>➤ Key informants in participating Ministries and TFS and other ministries responsible for PAs and FNRs;</li> <li>➤ Regional Government, CSOs/partners;</li> <li>➤ Selected Beneficiaries</li> </ul>
Stakeholder Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?</li> <li>• Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project?</li> <li>• Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?</li> <li>• To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives</li> </ul>	
Reporting and communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have changes made via adaptive management been reported by the project management and approved by the Project Board.</li> <li>• How well do the Project Team and partners understand and undertake UNDP and GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)</li> <li>• Have lessons derived from the adaptive management process been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners?</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is internal project communication with stakeholders done?</li> <li>• Is it regular and perceived to be effective? What is the evidence of that?</li> <li>• Are there key stakeholders left out of communication?</li> <li>• Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received?</li> <li>• Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?</li> <li>• How does the project communicate with the broader stakeholders? Via a project website?</li> <li>• Has an awareness campaign been mounted?</li> <li>• How does the project inform itself of progress in the field of CIEWS?</li> </ul>	
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module the most important and are the risk ratings applied appropriate and up to date? If not, why?</li> <li>• <b>Financial risks to sustainability</b> - What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends?</li> <li>• What plans are in place for mobilizing financial resources to carry on the work – especially of maintenance of CIEWS equipment and retain highly skilled staff members after the GEF Grant?</li> <li>• Does the project have an exit strategy to ensure sustainability?</li> <li>• <b>Socio-economic risks to sustainability:</b> Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes?</li> <li>• What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?</li> <li>• Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow?</li> <li>• Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?</li> <li>• Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?</li> <li>• <b>Institutional Framework &amp; Governance risks to sustainability:</b> Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits?</li> <li>• Are there systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer in place?</li> <li>• <b>Environmental risks to sustainability:</b> Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?</li> <li>• <b>What recommendations do you have for any of the issues raised above?</b></li> </ul>	

### 6.3 EXAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE OR INTERVIEW GUIDE USED FOR DATA COLLECTION

Stakeholder category	Sample questions
PMU, MAWF extension staff and PSC – all questions are asked of PMU and MAWF extension staff. The	<p>On Progress</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) An analysis of project implementation to date – going through the logframe, activity by activity, please highlight what has been implemented and key results delivered</li> <li>2) Please summarize how many beneficiaries have so far benefited from</li> </ol>



<p>letters PSC are appended to those questions also asked of the PSC</p>	<p>each of the key activities/outputs of the project, disaggregated by gender.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3) What in your estimation is the percentage implementation per output, when you consider the activities implemented and the results delivered?</li> <li>4) What would you say is the greatest impact of this project in your view, and why? - PSC</li> <li>5) What challenges have you faced related to implementation so far and how have you used adaptive management to address them? - PSC</li> <li>6) What good practices did you experience related to implementation and how did they influence implementation and achievement of results? - PSC</li> <li>7) What lessons have you derived from dealing with either challenges or good practices and how have you captured and/or shared them? - PSC</li> </ol> <p>Related to project design and quality of M&amp;E at entry:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Did you participate in the Project Inception Phase/workshop? - PSC</li> <li>2) Have you read the project document and what is your assessment of how well the project design captures the challenges related to forest conservation, JFMPs and generating revenues from both? - PSC</li> <li>3) In your view, was project formulation process participatory and why do you think it was or it wasn't (where's the evidence)?</li> <li>4) How well do you think the program of work matches the budget proposed? - PSC</li> <li>5) How easy has it been to use the indicators and baseline values provided in the project document to monitor the project's implementation and impacts?</li> <li>6) What, in your view, is the impact of the assumptions outlined in the prodoc? - PSC</li> <li>7) Have any of the assumptions become an enabler or a challenge for implementation or results delivery? - PSC</li> <li>8) How has the PMU monitored risks and assumptions and what do you suggest to change for the project to be successful by MTR</li> <li>9) What challenges/good practices have you experienced in relation to project design and indicators, and how did you use adaptive management to solve them? - PSC</li> <li>10) What is the impact of the response to question 6 on the state of implementation today, and what would you do differently? - PSC</li> </ol> <p>On Management implementation arrangement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) What, in your view, is the management implementation arrangement for this project? - PSC</li> <li>2) Is that what was described in the project document or has it been modified? - PSC</li> <li>3) If it has been modified, why was it deemed necessary and what approvals were sought after modifications? - PSC</li> <li>4) Have the modifications been documented and approved? - PSC</li> <li>5) What is the impact of the departure or compliance with the implantation arrangements on the rate of project implementation, delivery of results and the sustainability of expected impacts? - PSC</li> <li>6) What would you do differently – or needs to be modified for the second part of the project lifetime? - PSC</li> </ol>
--	---

	<p>On stakeholder participation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Please describe how stakeholders have participated in the project implementation; - PSC</li> <li>2) Is this state of participation in line with the planned stakeholder participation plan in the prodoc? - PSC</li> <li>3) If there was a change, why was it necessary? - PSC</li> <li>4) Was the change documented and relevant approvals obtained? - PSC</li> <li>5) If not, why not, and what has been the impact of such changes to the overall project, especially the rate of implementation, results delivery and sustainability? - PSC</li> <li>6) How has adaptive management been applied in project implementation related to stakeholder participation? - PSC</li> <li>7) What do you think should be adjusted in order to increase the effectiveness of project implementation and increase chances of sustaining the impacts? - PSC</li> </ol> <p>Regarding reporting and communication</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Do you fully understand UNDP and GEF project reporting requirements?</li> <li>2) Are these in line (or supportive) of the governments and TFS reporting requirements?</li> <li>3) How many reports (PIRs) has the PCU produced? Have you had any feedback from UNDP, GEF, Government and Regional Councils on the reports?</li> <li>4) How many technical reports has the project produced? If not why not and what is the plan to produce some?</li> <li>5) What needs to be done to increase the quality of reports and number of technical publications out of this project?</li> <li>6) How are you ensuring that practice will inform policy out of this project?</li> <li>7) What communications and awareness raising material has been produced and how is it disseminated?</li> <li>8) How is the project monitoring whether the awareness</li> </ol> <p>On project level M&amp;E</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Returning to the issue of indicators, has the project tested their suitability in monitoring project impacts involving beneficiaries and those stakeholders engaged in implementation?</li> <li>2) Has the project formulated a participatory M&amp;E system?</li> <li>3) If not, why not?</li> <li>4) How do you think the lack of a participatory M&amp;E system affects adaptive management of the project and linking practice and policies?</li> <li>5) Has action research been implemented yet?</li> <li>6) If not why not and is there a plan to accelerate its implementation?</li> <li>7) What should be done differently to improve participatory M&amp;E in support of adaptive management and sustainability of results?</li> </ol> <p>On sustainability</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) What results do you think the project will deliver that need to be sustained? - PSC</li> <li>2) What in your view is the project mechanism to sustain these results? - PSC</li> <li>3) More specifically, what are the mechanisms for ensuring institutions</li> </ol>
--	--

	<p>and governance sustainability? Financial sustainability? Environmental sustainability? Socio-economics sustainability? - PSC</p> <p>4) What challenges do you foresee with sustainability along any of these four criteria? - PSC</p> <p>3) What should the project do between now and the MTR to secure long-term sustainability? - PSC</p> <p>On support from PSC and UNDP</p> <p>1) How has the PSC supported PCU on any aspects of the project implementation?</p> <p>2) How about UNDP?</p> <p>3) What would you recommend regarding support received from the two going forward?</p> <p>In general</p> <p>1) What issues should the MTR look into that we have not yet discussed? - PSC</p> <p>2) Please summarize the challenges faced by the project on any aspect; - PSC</p> <p>3) Please summarize the good practices you would like to share with the MTR on any aspect of the project- PSC</p> <p>4) Summarize recommendations going forward if the project was to be successful.</p> <p>5) Any other issues? - PSC</p>
Communities	<p>General participation and beneficiation;</p> <p>1) Describe how you have participated in the project and its activities</p> <p>2) What benefits are you deriving from the project?</p> <p>3) What responsibilities do you have regarding the benefits and the project in general?</p> <p>4) How have the project benefits changed your life?</p> <p>5) Have you been involved in monitoring and evaluation of the project?</p> <p>6) What training have you received from the project?</p> <p>7) How has the training made a difference to the way you manage your land and produce food or meet other livelihood support activities?</p> <p>8) What challenges do you still experience with implementation of the JFMPs?</p> <p>9) Do you know any that have actually adopted the technologies piloted by the project on their own?</p> <p>10) If not what do they say is the challenge?</p> <p>11) How will you sustain the benefits you are getting from the project once the PCU is disbanded?</p> <p>12) What challenges do you foresee for sustaining the impacts and how can you or your leaders/government help to resolve them?</p> <p>13) What recommendations to you have for the project managers and funders in order to improve the way the project is being implemented?</p> <p>4)</p>

#### 6.4 ANNEX 4: RATINGS SCALES

6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without
---	--------------------------	--

		major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The Project has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

## 6.5 ANNEX 5: MTR MISSION ITINERARY

Date	Activity	Responsible
15 <sup>th</sup> – 19 <sup>th</sup> March 2018	Desk Review of Project Documents	Consultants
20 <sup>th</sup> March	MTR Inception Meeting, UNDP, Dar es Salaam Briefing at the Project Office at TFS (Mpingo House) Consultations with Stakeholders: TFCG and WWF - CO	Gertrude/Tula PC & Project Director Gerald Kamwenda/Florian Mkeya  Consultant
21 <sup>st</sup> -23 <sup>rd</sup> March 2018	Field visits: Travel from Dar es Salaam to Magamba and Chome NRs Visit Head Office Construction at Magamba and Manolo & Kwenangu Ranger posts Consultations at Same NFR, Inspect Progress of Head Office Construction, Tourism Information centre Travel to Morogoro	Consultants and the Project Coordinators
23/03/2018	Field visit – Uluguru NR, Mkingu NR Kwadoli/Kibati/Mkindo Ranger posts & Head Office at Mkindo	Consultants
24/03/2018	Travel to Dar es Salaam	Consultants
25/03/2018	Fly to Mbeya	Consultants
26/03/2018	Visit Mt. Rungwe NR Head Office construction via Isongole, Kandoro and Syukula ranger posts Consultations with stakeholders	Consultants
27/03/2018	Consultation with WCT and TFS Mbeya Office	Consultants
28/03/2018	Fly back to Dar es Salaam	Consultants
28-29/03/2018 –	Writing the report and prepare for de-briefing	Consultants

Date	Activity	Responsible
5/4/2018:		
04/04/2018	Consultation and updates with Project team	Consultants
06/04/2018	Mission wrap-up meeting and presentation of initial findings- end of MTR mission involving the PSC members and other stakeholders - PO RALG, MOF, VPO, MNRT - Morogoro	Consultants Project Team
23 <sup>rd</sup> – 25 <sup>th</sup> April 2018	Incorporation of comments	Consultants
27 <sup>th</sup> April 2018	MTR completion and final report submission	Consultants

## 6.6 ANNEX 6: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Name	Organization	Position	Contact
Gertrude Lyatuu	UNDP	Deputy Country Director	
Andrew Yohana	UNDP	Financial Analyst	
Irene Kajuna	UNDP	Procurement Officer	
Alphonse Kisesebe	UNDP	Procurement Specialist	
Florian Mkeya	TFS	Project Manager/Director	0754279103
Gerald Kamwenda	TFS	Project Coordinator	0784325706
Isaac Malugu	WWF TCO	Forest Program Coordinator	0784775877
Samji Mlemba	Magamba NR	Ag Conservator	
Bryson Kahabuka	Magamba NR	Beekeeping Officer	
Athumani Hamza	Manoro Village	VEO	
A. Mkande	Manoro Village	Village Government Secretary	
Angelina Kahena	Manoro village	Village Government Secretary	
Ignas Lupala	TFS Same	Assistant Zonal Manager	
Florence T Kileo	Chome FNR	Tourist Officer	
Samwel Laiton		Tourist Officer	
Gregory Mvamba		Tourist Officer	
Ali Abeid	Kwenangu village	Chairperson	
Athumani Mshimbula		Ex Chairperson	
Saum Hamis Kingu		VEO	0717 418973
Aloysia Mbana		Member of Village government	
Ellas Mugilla	Uluguru NR	Ag Conservator	
Simon Lolban		Ranger	
Paulo Charles	Mkingu NR	Ag Conservator	
Abdallah Kileo	Kwadoli Village	Village chairperson	
Hamis Mgombwa		Village government member	
Amini Mohamed		Village government member	
Mwanahawa Emanuel		Village Government Secretary	
Innocent Lupembe	Mt. Rungwe NR	Conservator	0763641437
M. Kazumari	Mt. Rungwe NR	Ranger	

Name	Organization	Position	Contact
Bernard Malechela	Syukula Village	VEO	
Israel Mwandago	Syukula Village	Tree Nursery Manager	
Justin Mavilla	Syukula Village	Nursery attendant	
Hakimu Mwakipesile	Syukula Village	Village chairperson	
Hamis Gasper	Bugingijila village	VEO	
Ambindwile Kengeti		Village Chairperson	
Tabea Njela		Village Government Member	
Japhet Mwasamaleba		Village Government Member	
Noah Mpunga	WCS	Director	
Gerald Kamwenda	TFS	PC	0784325706
Betty Luwuge	TFCG	Programmes Manager	0754479766
Sanford Kwayi	PO RALG	Coordinator, Environment and Natural Resources	0754290074
Ben Mwigulu	Minziro NR	Conservator	0754811730
Prof. Dos Santos Silayo	TFS	CEO	0768915151
Natalie Boucly	UNDP	Country Director	Natalie.boucly@undp.org
Joseph J. Chuwa	Morogoro	RNRO	0755858803
Gertruda Nganyagwa	Magamba	Conservator	0758165824
Simon Parmet	RAS Mbeya	RNRO	0768599101
Johanes R. Jovin	MoFP	Principal Economist	0786434540
Abeid Kindo	TFS Mkingu RNR	Conservator	0759229874
Tulalomba Bangu	UNDP	Programme Assistant-Environment	0789941985
Fabian Mkome	TFS	Conservator Nilo NR	0753570730
Cuthbert Mafupa	TFS	Conservator Uluguru NR	07564570978
Julius Mkumbo	TFS	Conservator Mt. Hanang NR	0784969964
Michael Gwandu	RAS Manyara	RNRO	0755469552
Timotheo Sosiya	RAS Tanga	RNRO	0719889599
Zawadi Jilala	RAS Lindi	RNRO	0788604192
Haji Kiselu	RAS Kagera	RNRO	0787242464
Ahazi Shayo	TFS	Ag. Conservator , Rondo NR	0656542807
Yusuph Tango	TFS	Forest Officer, Uzungwa Scarp	0764556999
Elia Mdeme	TFS	Conservator, Kilombero NR	0784496337
Aloyce Mawere	RAS Iringa	RNRO	0754404467
Mwanaidi Kijazi	TFS	Conservator, Amani NR	0784587805
Emanuel Kiyengi	RAS Kilimanjaro	RNRO	0712081010

## 6.7 ANNEX 7: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

- Project Documents:
  - The UNDP Project Document TNZ 5106

- Project Inception Report
- Project Annual and Quarterly Work plans and Financial plans
- Progress Reports:
  - Technical Implementation Reports QPRs (APR/PIRs)
  - Finalized M&E Tracking Tool
  - Management Effectiveness (METT) and Financial Score Cards (FSC) Reports
  - M&E baselines and reports
  - Mission Reports and Lessons learnt Study
  - M&E Operational Guidelines, Monitoring reports prepared by the project
  - Project Operational Guidelines, Manuals and systems
  - Minutes of the FNR PSC Committee Meetings
- Financial Reports
  - FACE and Project Combined Delivery Reports (CDRs)
  - Project Audit Reports
  - Financial and Administration Guidelines
- Technical Publications
  - Nature Reserves Profiles, Posters, Leaflets, Newsletters/Journals and Manuals
  - Joint Forest Management Agreements, FNR Management Plans, Ecotourism Plans
  - Project site location maps
  - Branding and awareness raising materials (brochures, pamphlets, diaries, calendars, and information sheets) most of these posted on the website <http://www.nature-reserves.go.tz>.
- National Policy Documents Legal Frameworks and Strategies
  - The National Environment Policy (NEP, 1997)
  - The Environmental Management Act (EMA, 2004)
  - The Land Act (1999) and the Village Land Act (1999)
  - The Forest Policy (1998) and the Forest Act (2002)
  - National Forest Programme and the TFS Strategic Plan

## 6.8 ANNEX 8: CO-FINANCING TABLE

Source of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount endorsement (US\$)	Actual Contribution at stage of Midterm Review (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
Government of Tanzania	TFS	In kind – salaries and operations	15,000,000.00	6,250,000.00	41.7
Government of Tanzania	TFS	Own income	300,000.00	200,000.00	66.7
EU	TFCG	In kind	1,800,000.00	1,440,000.00	80.0
USAID	WCS	In kind	400,000.00	200,000.00	50.0
NGO	WWF	In kind	400,000.00	400,000.00	100.0
	UNDP	Grant - Trac	1,000,000.00	149,617.56	15.0
	EAMCEF/Friends of Usambara	Grants for the Eastern Arc Mts NRs	700,000.00	714,285.71	102.0
GEF	UNDP	Grant	4,100,000.00	3,161,013.66	77.1
Total			23,700,000.00	12,514,916.93	52.8

## **6.9 ANNEX 9: MIDTERM METT AND FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY**

The Midterm Report for Management Effectiveness and Financial Score Cards (FSC) for 12 Forest Nature Reserves – (FNRs) of March 2018, is available as a separate document with UNDP CO and the Project Team Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.