

SADC Wetlands Conservation Project

PHASE II

Mid-Term Review

Final Report

by

Joshua M. Nyoni
Kjetil Bevanger
Svein Aage Mehli

Lilongwe, 4 June 2003

Content

	Page
Preface	4
List of Acronyms	5
1 Overall Comments and Recommendations	6
2 General introduction	8
2.1 Background information	8
2.2 Terms of Reference	8
2.3 Southern Africa Development Community (SADC)	9
2.4 The World Conservation Union, Regional Office for Southern Africa (IUCN•ROSA)	9
2.5 Project implementation	9
2.5.1 Observations	9
3 Capacity building (Training Courses/Workshops/Seminars)	10
3.1 Introduction	10
3.2 Observations	10
3.3 Analysis	12
3.4 Recommendations	12
4 Management plans	13
4.1 Introduction	13
4.2 Observations	14
4.3 Analysis	14
4.4 Recommendations	14
5 Information Exchange	15
5.1 Introduction	15
5.2 Observations	15
5.2.1 Technical facilities	15
5.2.2 Internet as a main road for information exchange	16
5.2.3 National Wetland Working Groups	16
5.3 Analysis	16
5.3.1 Technical facilities	16
5.3.2 Internet as a main road for information exchange	17
5.3.3 National Wetland Working Groups	18
5.4 Recommendations	18
6 Research	18
6.1 Introduction	18
6.2 Observations	19
6.2.1 Priority of wetland research areas	19
6.2.2 Research funding	19
6.3 Analysis	20
6.3.1 Priority of wetland research area	20
6.3.2 Research funding	21

6.4	Recommendations	22
7	Other issues	22
7.1	Institutions	
7.1.1	Introduction	22
7.1.2	Observations	22
7.1.3	Assessment of PIU Capabilities	23
7.1.4	Analysis	24
7.1.5	Recommendations	24
7.2	Monitoring and Evaluation	24
7.2.1	Introduction	24
7.2.2	Observations	24
7.2.3	Analysis	25
7.2.4	Recommendations	25
7.3	Gender issues	25
	References	26
	Annexes	27
Annex 1.	Mid-Term Review Programme	27
Annex 2	Terms of Reference for the Review	30
Annex 3	Progress on Wetland Management outcomes	39

Preface

In a letter dated May 13, 2003, NORAD requested the Directorate for Nature Management (DN), to participate in a Mid-Term Review Team to evaluate the project SADC Regional Wetlands Conservation Project Phase II. The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Mid-Term Review is given in Annex 2. The Appraisal Team consisted of three experts; Mr Svein Aage Mehli and Dr. Kjetil Bevanger were recruited by NORAD, Oslo, whereas Mr. Joshua M. Nyoni was recruited by IUCN•ROSA, Harare, respectively. In a meeting in Lilongwe May 20, 2003, it was proposed by SADC WSTCU and supported by NORAD to have Mr. Svein Aage Mehli to function as a leader of the Review Team.

The field work lasted from May 19 to June 6 (cf. Annex 1 for Mission Program). The project draft report was discussed at NORAD/Lilongwe June 5, 2003 at the Project Annual Meeting.

The Review Team would like to thank the IUCN•ROSA staff in Harare, in particular the Programme Coordinator Mr. Lenka Thamae, and Ms. Charity Kayiya who coordinated the logistical and travel arrangements; and Mr. Per Mogstad at the Norwegian Embassy in Lilongwe. We also want to express our gratitude to the Institutions and persons met during the mission for their valuable assistance and input. As Team Leader I want to thank my colleagues in the evaluation team in particular for excellent work and a positive and productive attitude to a challenging task.

Lilongwe, 04 June 2003

Svein Aage Mehli
Team Leader

List of Acronyms

CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CFI	Country Focal Institution
CBNRM	Community Based Natural Resource Management
CBO	Community Based Organization
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species
COSTECH	Tanzania Commission on Science and Technology
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DEAT	Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (South Africa)
DNFFB	Direccao Nacional de Florestas e Fauna Bravia (Mozambique)
DNPW	Department of National Parks and Wildlife (Malawi)
DNR	Department of Natural Resources (Zimbabwe)
ECZ	Environment Council of Zambia
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EU	The European Union
FANR	SADC Department for Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources
FSTCUSADC	Forestry Sector Technical Coordination Unit, Malawi
GIS	Geographic Information System
GTA	
IT	Information Technology
IUCN	The world Conservation Union
IWMI	International Water Management Institute
IWSD	Institute for Water and Sanitation Development
MBERU	Molecular Biology and Ecology Research Unit (Malawi)
MICOA	Ministério para a Coordinacao de Accao Ambiental (Mozambique)
MPRT	Marine Parks and Reserves (Tanzania)
NCI	National Contact Institution
NCSA	National Conservation Strategy Agency, Botswana
NEMC	National Environmental Management
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for International Development Cooperation
NRM	Natural Resource Management
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
PS	Permanent Secretary
ROSA	IUCN Regional Office for Southern Africa
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SADC WRF	SADC Wetlands Research Fund
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
TAWIRI	Tanzania Wildlife Research Institution
WARFSA	Water Research Fund for Southern Africa
WSTCU	SADC Wildlife Sector Technical Coordination Unit, Malawi
WTC	Wetlands Technical Committee
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature
ZIMOZA	Zimbabwe-Mozambique-Zambia

1 Overall Comments and Recommendations

- 1.1 National policies, plans and strategies for wetlands are in different stages of finalisation among the Member States. Such national plans and policies are of outmost importance in the effective utilization of capacity building; make use of information exchange systems and research programs, for projects run by SADC countries. The project assumption, that the SADC Member States have commitment to wetland issues does not, however, always hold for some countries. In this regard, the project is advised to review plans and priorities to direct and clearly focus on the development of integrated national wetland plans and policies within agreed time frames.
- 1.2 Developing plans, programmes and policy on wetlands at the national level is seen as a participatory process between stakeholders, managed by government. The governments have established as their response, a national focal institution with authority to handle matters in relation to the different government sectors and in relation to other stakeholders and to the SADC Secretariat. The role of the focal institution is to create awareness among politicians, establishing policies and plans on wetlands, the involvement of different sectors and to inform broadly on wetland issues to all stakeholders.
- 1.3 In parallel, activities within organisations which serve as a catalyst, and use wetlands as a vehicle to raise awareness and enthusiasm on wetland issues should be stimulated. Rehabilitation and wise use of wetlands could also contribute considerably to poverty alleviation. Further, the practical implementation of wetlands on district and local level should be prioritized.
- 1.4 The Policy Makers Seminar held in Gaborone (March 3-4 2003), is characterised as successful. In particular the presentation of the national wetlands policy for Uganda was well received at this seminar. In the light of the importance of having developed national plans for wetlands including functional national authorities for all SADC members, the Review Team would like to propose that the Uganda case combined with strategies for awareness raising be presented at the platforms for discussions as part of national seminars on policy development of wetlands. Such national seminars should be offered to SADC member States as an integrated part of the continued wetland project.
- 1.5 The institutional relations with the SADC Secretariat in Gaborone should be improved. Given the organisational changes within SADC and the strengthening of the Secretariat functions and increased formal responsibilities even for ongoing projects, the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) could be based in Gaborone under the general direction and oversight of SADC. This will also allow greater input by the project into SADC thinking and activities. The PIU would, however, continue as a unit within IUCN as the organisation best equipped to be the responsible implementing institution.
- 1.6 There is a need for further research on wetlands in the SADC area, and the research priorities should be developed through internal participatory processes in the member States led by the national focal authority. However, at this stage the Review Team will not support the creation of a special fund for regional research activities as proposed by IWSD. Research may be supported if it has direct relations to localities or elements in the project.

- 1.7 Selection of candidates and information concerning capacity building and training activities need to be improved. The role and importance of National Focal Points/appointed responsible government institutions in informing and sensitizing other sectors and stakeholders on the content, goals and objectives for the training courses, cannot be underestimated. Mechanisms for how training can be redistributed to others need to be more focused and developed.
- 1.8 The selection of localities for developing or facilitating management plans for different wetland types may be carefully characterised as very ambitious. The four localities chosen are partly well documented from previous research or monitoring activities or they are very large and represent types of wetlands of almost global importance. The Review Team would have liked to see more guidance from IUCN on how wetland management plans should be developed and with well defined outputs. In addition, the Review Team would like to propose to limit the aspirations for the Makgadikgadi pans management plan to the production of a well documented project document instead, which might be used to solicit separate funds for its finalisation of the actual Plan.
- 1.9 The organisation of the training courses with delegates from all member states participating has made the courses very expensive with substantial costs for accommodation and travel arrangements and with relatively few people trained. Sub-regional or national training courses could have made the training more cost-effective, direct and cheaper with more people trained. The procedure of selection of candidates should be looked into to identify the most suitable candidates for wetland issues.
- 1.10 The creation of a website on wetlands for the SADC member States is strongly supported by the Review Team. The same conclusion may also be drawn from the talks with institutions and organizations visited. The resources allocated for the Information exchange website seem, however, to be seriously overestimated. From observations made by the Review Team, there seems to be no need to assist countries in buying technical equipment like computers. The responsibilities for the website's functioning after the project completion need further discussion and clarification. There could be options either to have the website run by the SADC Secretariat or by an NGO or a national institution. In any case, continuous updating and maintenance is of crucial importance in the management of the website.
- 1.11 The SADC Wetland project is an important project with strong bearing on the management of wetlands in the SADC area. Phase 1, however, was concluded about 10 years ago and it was therefore little direct transfer of implementation capacity and knowledge between phase 1 and phase 2. Starting up the implementation of phase 2 with all its complex and demanding elements was therefore a formidable task for the implementing institution. The task was also voluminous, and from the very beginning of the project more input of manpower could have been evaluated. Following the complex nature of the project, it seems that it also could have greatly benefited from inputs from a close dialogue with other relevant institutions on wetlands in the direct implementation of the project. The Review Team would therefore like to propose that up to the finalization of phase II project, a dialogue is established with a Norwegian management institution on wetlands, which may serve as a discussion partner and adviser to the project.

1.12 The SADC Wetland Project has picked up momentum. The institutions visited have generally been positive and supportive of the project. According to the existing plans the project is to be concluded by July 1, 2004. The Review Team however, is of the opinion that the SADC Regional Wetland Project should continue for an additional year to July 1, 2005, which would contribute substantially to the fulfillment of project goals, but with a more clear focus and stronger emphasis on capacity building in the member States.

2 General introduction

2.1 Background Information

The implementation of the SADC Regional Wetlands Conservation Project Phase II started in April 2001 with the project coordinator, however, getting on board in July 1, 2001. The project has a time frame of three years, which means that it will be concluded by July 1, 2004. The project is thoroughly described in the revised project document and in related documents. For details on the history of the project we make reference to these documents. It is a regional project supposed to serve all the SADC member states. IUCN Regional Office for Southern Africa (IUCN•ROSA) is the implementation agency for the project on behalf of SADC.

The SADC Wildlife Sector Technical Coordinating Unit, in the department of National Parks and Wildlife in Malawi, has until recently been the agency charged with responsibility for the coordination of Wildlife issues in SADC. In this regard support to Wetland Conservation Project was funded through an agreement signed between NORAD and the Government of Malawi.

The first Annual Meeting for the project was held in Lilongwe in April 2002. The Annual Meeting identified the need for a mid-term review of the project although such a review was not included in the original project document. The meeting recommended that in order to assess the effectiveness of the approach adopted by the project, reinforce commitment by member States and to evaluate the impact of the project at regional and national levels, a mid-term review should be conducted. The review would be undertaken under the overall framework of project monitoring and evaluation and may recommend review of outputs, change in approach and/or more emphasis on aspects of the activity plan.

The Review Team of three members was established in May 2003, one consultant recruited from the SADC area and two NORAD-recruited consultants from Norway. NORAD secured funds from outside the project for the consultants recruited from Norway.

The field work related to the review was done in the period 19 - 31 May, 2003. Annex 1 which is the Review Programme gives a list of institutions visited and persons met during the field work. For practical and economical purposes and to be more efficient, the Review Team split into two groups with different travel arrangements during parts of the field work.

2.2 Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the project are enclosed as Annex 2. The Team agreed with the ToR document as it was formulated. However, the Review Team would like to extend the comments also to include institutional and organisational relations and commitment on wetland issues among the SADC member states as elements of this have been stated as a clear assumption for successful implementation of the project. The Team would further like to comment upon the role of IUCN in relation to capacity building at the national and regional levels and the possibility of additional strengthening of the capacity of the member states before the project is concluded.

2.3 Southern Africa Development Community (SADC)

The SADC Secretariat is located in Gaborone, Botswana. At the time this project on wetlands started, the responsibilities for projects on activity areas were distributed among the member states. In the case of wetlands, the responsibility was with the SADC Wildlife Sector Technical Co-ordination Unit (SADC WSTCU) in Malawi. Recently SADC has decided to establish the formal responsibility for all project activities related to SADC to be with the Secretariat in Gaborone. For wetlands, SADC Directorate for Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources (SADC FANR) is the responsible unit. However, it seems that for projects established before the formal decisions on the re-organisation were made, will continue with the original arrangements until completed.

2.4 The World Conservation Union, Regional Office for Southern Africa (IUCN•ROSA)

The Project Implementation Unit (PIU) for the project is located within the main office of IUCN•ROSA in Harare, Zimbabwe. IUCN•ROSA has considerable expertise and knowledge both in wetland issues and related issues. The project proposal for resumption of SADC Wetland Conservation Project Phase II was drawn up by IUCN•ROSA in 1998.

2.5 Project implementation

2.5.1 Observations

The contract between SADC WSTCU and IUCN•ROSA was signed in October 2000. As the proposals had been drawn over a long time in the late 1990s IUCN•ROSA sought to confirm the needs and commitments of the SADC member countries. Eleven member States of SADC were engaged in consultations, either through a workshop, a meeting or by electronic discussion during the period June to September 2001. Reports from the meetings were made available to the Review Team on the number of delegates who participated in those meetings and the conclusions. The participants in the meetings generally, represented a broad spectrum of government agencies and at different national levels.

Specific emphasis at the meetings was made of introducing the project to stakeholders, to confirm the project priorities and activities, to register the current national wetland conservation efforts and identify synergies and lastly to agree on national implementation arrangements. In general, the countries confirmed their commitment to the project at the meetings, agreed with the priorities identified and activities scheduled. Requests for additional support for the implementation of national programmes were registered at the meetings.

As a part of the project implementation, an inception workshop aimed at reviewing and adopting the implementation arrangements at the regional level, was held in Pretoria (26-27 September 2001). The workshop agreed on a list for demonstration sites and the criteria for selection of a limited number of sites. The meeting further agreed on criteria for selection of training institutions for the capacity building training component; and on the process for the development of an information exchange network. The meeting concluded with a list of regional priority research areas and adoption of the revised project document.

Capacity Building Activities

3.1 Introduction

The project document envisaged that a total of five training courses and a workshop were to be arranged over the three year life span of the project in order to fulfill the main objective of building technical and managerial capacities of wetlands in the region. Four of the courses were to be on wetland ecosystem dynamics and integrated management focusing on the four wetland types prioritized by SADC in the consultative meetings referred to above.

3.2 Observations

The subject matter of wetlands in all the countries visited seems to be a phenomenon that is relatively new, having been adopted in the last ten years. It has no significant coverage by the government departments charged with environmental management. It is therefore, not surprising to find that in terms of technical personnel with the requisite expertise to deal with these areas, there is noticeable dearth of skills. Most officers found in the departments with wetlands responsibilities are formally trained in pure biology, animal science, geography, water engineering, agriculture, marine ecology and other disciplines. However, the management of wetlands has proved to be complex and requires a multidisciplinary approach and expertise encompassing appreciation of both the biological and socio-economic components of the wetland. This is the challenge that has necessitated the need for building capacities in the agencies dealing with wetlands. Capacity building is a never-ending activity in development. It has to be continually revisited by the implementing institutions.

In the period under review there have been three formal training sessions in the project component termed capacity building, viz:

- A six week course on Wetland Ecosystem Dynamics and Integrated Management Techniques (Palustrine) at the former Molecular Biology and Ecology Research Unit-Chancellor College, (University of Malawi) Zomba Malawi. 14 participants were trained during this course.
- A four-week course on Conflict Management and Participatory Approaches was held at the Thaba Bosiu Lesotho between 18 November and 13 December 2002. 14 participants attended the course.
- A four-week course in Wetland Dynamics and integrated management techniques (Riverine) at the Freshwater Research Unit, University of Cape Town South Africa between 10 March to 17 April 2003. 10 participants attended this course.

The choice of course venue and subject matter was done through a consultative process in the SADC member states. After an appraisal of the submitted proposals on the course to be undertaken the SADC – Wildlife Sector Coordinating Unit (Malawi) and the IUCN•ROSA entered into contract with the chosen institution to carry out the training. The choice of who was to attend these courses was left to the contact points in the respective countries.

The main objective of the courses was to equip managers and planners of wetlands with requisite skills to undertake development of wetland plans in their respective countries. Those trained at the regional level were to provide training to other fellow officers at the individual country level. The responsibility for the country level training was not part of the IUCN•ROSA mandate under the SADC Regional Wetlands Conservation Project Phase II.

As of December 2002 some 38 officials from the region's governments and NGO agencies had benefited from the training offered under the Programme. Resource manuals were produced in hard copy as well as in electronic versions.

In all the countries visited, during the review (Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, South Africa and Zimbabwe) none of those that had received training at the regional level had undertaken any formal imparting of skills at the country level through training others. In two countries (Mozambique and Zimbabwe) there was mention of the fact that the materials received were going to be introduced into local course manuals on similar topics for seminar/workshops still to be undertaken. The officer who attended the Conflict Resolution course in the case of Zimbabwe was tasked to draw up a departmental paper on Wetland Management for his department of Natural Resources in recognition of the exposure and expertise received during the training course. He has also been used as a resource person in his department's-run courses on Participatory Rural Appraisals in 8 out of the 57 Rural District Councils.

Those attending the courses rated them fairly highly in all cases, in terms of their relevancy and usefulness to their work at home. The 92% of the course participants in the Wetlands Dynamics course held in Zomba, Malawi felt it "absolutely relevant". More seemed to be gleaned from exposure to field situations rather than from mere lectures as it made the practice of wetland management a real live issue in the African context. Participants also reported that they benefited immensely from cross-country exchanges of information and experiences on wetland management issues. The time duration of more than four weeks, however, as in the case of the Malawi course, was felt to be too long. The different qualifications of the course participants, although initially feared to be a problem, turned out to be a strength, as it led to very good cross-fertilisation and exchange of views and experiences

Course follow up on return to the home country seemed to have been very poor all round. The need to ensure that the original objective of enhancing broad awareness of wetland management issues beyond the individuals that attended the courses or their respective departments, was poorly followed through.

Difficulties with language were expressed by the lusophonic countries (Mozambique and Angola), when it comes to the in-country dissemination of materials received during training, as they have to be translated into Portuguese first. This is not often budgeted in the line ministries and departments' allocation.

The Regional Policy Makers workshop to promote wise use and conservation of wetlands was held in Gaborone on 3-4 March 2003. In the revised project document, this workshop is characterised as one of the key outcomes of the project. A total of 11 countries participated in the workshop with total number of 48 delegates. Amongst this number were Permanent Secretaries and Directors and Heads of Departments dealing with Agriculture/Wildlife/Natural Resources-and wetland issues in the region. More than 20 delegates at the workshop represented Botswana. The main aim for the meeting was to advice policy makers on actions required, to update on developments of wetland management and to establish a working platform within SADC.

The reaction from those that attended this seminar was that it was a worthwhile exercise with positive impacts. The presentation of the experience of wetland management in Uganda by a resource person from that country was luminary and well received.

The existence of Working Groups on Wetlands (both formal and informal) as shown in the table in the annex 3, offers an opportunity for increasing awareness on the issues and can be used to disseminate

resource materials acquired in training courses if funding were sourced for this particular activity. It is a great concern that the sustainability of the Working Group is varied in the respective countries.

Under the training component of the programme, the greater amount of the budget was consumed by accommodation and regional travel of the participants. For greater impact of the programme overall, this item of the expenditure might need revisiting so as to save on costs.

3.3 Analysis

Wetlands management as an issue still seem to occupy lower priority in the development concerns of most of the countries of the region in comparison to such challenges as poverty eradication, the fight against HIV/AIDS, food shortages induced by unpredictable weather conditions and other constraints. However, the awareness of the role of wetlands in the national economies seems to be increasing. The commitment of countries of the region to mainstreaming the environmental concerns in wetland management is varied, as shown by the drawing up and promulgation of specific policies and strategies on wetland (as opposed to general environmental policies) and accession to international protocols such as the RAMSAR and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

The lines of responsibility in terms of the mandate to plan and manage wetlands are not always explicit in the respective SADC member countries. It was evident from the meetings held in the countries that the perceived roles of the lead agencies and their capacities were not always shared by other principal stakeholders in the respective countries. Tensions were often observed between various government departments dealing with wetlands. The coordination and overall responsibility for wetland management continues to be a problematic between the various government stakeholders.

In this regard the contribution to a change in attitude, and strengthening of capacities to do so, by implementation of the Phase II Wetlands Conservation Programme seems to be very limited, indeed. Part of the reason for this is the small numbers of personnel who were able to access the vital training offered under the programme. The fact that only one or at most, three officers from each country was able to attend the course in any one country location, is a far cry from the huge amount of work awaiting the incumbents on return to the home basis.

That there was no conscious follow-up on those trained to ensure that they too imparted their newly acquired skills as Trainers, led also to the limited impact of the Programme in most member countries.

The ability of the courses to enhance wetland management skills is still to be tested in the field. This will be clearer when incumbents have been able to meaningfully participate in the production of specific wetland management plans in their respective countries.

3.4 Recommendations

The main recommendations for the Capacity Building Activities of the project is that

- more courses could be arranged. The remaining courses could be modified to take care of greater numbers for greater impact at each country level. The model would involve a three pronged modular form involving say the following:
 - One or two week theory and broad overview at the host institution for two or three trainers from each country
 - Followed by a one or two week in the home country doing practicals including training of a bigger group of officers (supported by implementing institution)

- Concluded by one or two week course completion at initial host institution, including assessment, prior to a certificate of attendance being issued
- institutions having nominated candidates, should be bound to follow up those that have received training. Part of the pre-requisite for attending the course should be an agreement ensuring practical follow up, such as training others in-country, when the course is finished. This needs to be discussed with all the parties involved
- some of the courses could be arranged for a smaller grouping at the sub-regional level and in particular one that might take into consideration the language requirements of the lusophonic countries
- resource persons organized from a pool of experts from various institutions (both private and public) in the region could be used to undertake “ mobile” training in the countries so as to enhance regional approaches, cooperation and appreciation of the diversity of wetlands
- another form of training that might be investigated for the immediate and long-term, is distance education of officers. Wherever, possible officers would be encouraged to visit websites offering resource material from training institutions, IUCN and other supportive institutions in the region and beyond. Apparently there is the “WetNet initiative, which is offering water-related, postgraduate training through cooperation among SADC universities”(IWMI) This is worth investigating and incorporating in the information exchange component of the programme
- an inventory of the institutions offering training in various aspects of wetlands, courses on offer, staff complement and expertise e.t.c., should be created and posted on the SADC wetlands website.

4. Management Plans

4.1 Introduction

According to the Revised Project Document of October 2001, a number of countries have in recent years made progress in developing management plans for their key wetlands while others are in the process of doing so. Some experiences have been gained, but the issue of wetland management plan development is still a challenge. It should further be noted that management plan development is a complicated process that requires a lot of time and resources to be finalised. It is in this recognition it was therefore outlined in the PD that the project component will depend largely on already existing information and mainly seek to complement already existing processes.

The PD also underlines that the process of developing management plans have to involve local communities and stakeholders in general.

On the availability of resources under phase II, the PD summarises that these resources are not adequate to support the elaborate and complicated processes of developing comprehensive management plans. What the project therefore tends to do is to set aside funds to support project proposal development or the implementation of existing management plans. The aim of this exercise is to develop or to adjust existing guidelines to fit more precisely into the management of wetlands in an African context and to use these sites as demonstration to train people in the development of wetland management plans.

Through consultations with member States, the following four wetland sites were selected;

- Makgadikgadi Pans - palustrine
- Pungwe - riverine
- Rufiji-Mafia Islands - marine
- Zambezi Delta - estuarine

4.2 Observations

The nine month work plan 01 October 2002 to 30 June 2003 by the IUCN•ROSA envisaged that all four sites in this component would have completed their baseline surveys and “in a similar manner the project will embark on identification of management objectives and strategic action plans for this (these) wetland systems. Further details of the approach and time schedule will become clear when the base line surveys have been completed”. It was evident from the field visits undertaken by the Review Team that many of the sites were having considerable difficulties in starting off the blocks. No baseline surveys were reported in any of the locations yet, except for the Tanzania case where the -Mafia Island Park Management Planning had just be completed after eight years in the making! The National Environmental Management Council of Tanzania reported that another initiative of developing the Simiyu (Riverine System) Management Plan had just reached draft form after two years. Mozambique’s MICOA had as recently as February 2003 started to discuss on how to go about doing their Management plans component of the Wetlands Programme.

There seems to be misunderstandings on the part of the country focal points on what they are expected to achieve on this component at the end of this programme.

4.3 Analysis

It would appear that the component of “development of Management Plans for the four representative wetlands’ was not adequately conceptualized from the beginning. It is not clear what the programme hoped to achieve in the three-year period of its implementation as evidenced by the statement in the paragraph above.

The magnitude of developing a Management Plan for any wetland, seems not to have been fully appreciated in the programme design. That Tanzania’s experience (both Simiyu and Mafia Island) and that of Malawi (Lake Chilwa) was not brought forward and used in the planning of this component of the SADC Regional Wetlands Conservation Phase II project was a serious oversight on the part of both IUCN and SADC Wildlife Sector Technical Coordination Unit.

4.4 Recommendations

The main recommendations for the Management Plan Activities of the project is that

- the guidance from IUCN to the member States on how the wetland management plans should be implemented, should be clarified and strengthened
- the outputs should have been more clearly defined
- on the basis of information received, it will be possible within the limited time available, to produce only a project document for Makgadikgadi pans which may be used for demonstration of how to make of a management plan
- all sites need to be revised in relation to available information and what is practicable as a matter of urgency. To allow for more precise decisions at a later stage.

5 Information Exchange

5.1 Introduction

According to the programme documents there is limited exchange of information on wetlands within, and among, SADC member states; a problem which has been addressed in different ways. To meet this challenge it has been an aim of the programme to create a formal network of National Contact Institutions (NCI), i.e. institutions working directly with different aspects of wetland management, international issues on wetlands and/or those assigned custodianship of wetlands in the SADC member states. In RAMSAR signatory countries institutions are supposed to have been nominated by their governments to be the NCI. Thus, apart from overseeing and guiding implementation of the project, these institutions are also responsible for coordinating in-country wetlands initiatives.

In 2002 the project carried out a regional wetlands information assessment in the member states, revealing that the NCI's have data banks with information in both soft and hard copy formats. Computer facilities are available although there is a disparity in the level of competence and capacity. According to the project document, the project was supposed to assist member States to strengthen their national networks through provision of electronic facilities, and/or training of individuals on the use of the facilities where appropriate.

A specific action has been taken through the establishment of a regional wetlands website www.sadc-wetlands.org. The information content is related to key wetland issues and institutions. Thus the web site is supposed to be a route map for institutions engaged in aspects of wetlands management, development and conservation, the data available in these institutions etc. The website design has been based on the principle that the bulk of the national and transboundary data remain in their current locations. The only data and information directly available on the site is the one generated by the project itself or which is region- relevant by nature. It is expected that the website will be developed as a link and networking mechanism for wetland stakeholders in the region, as well as abroad.

The SADC Secretariat's Information Unit in Gaborone will house the website to secure sustainability beyond the project period. Format, design criteria and other key elements have been developed to be compatible with the future custodian system at the SADC Secretariat.

In March 2003 a regional policy maker's seminar in Gaborone was arranged. One of the issues on the seminar was how to secure political will and improve mechanisms/instruments of making information available to policy makers for decision making, i.e. marketing wetlands to policy makers to raise their profile.

The role and effectiveness of national wetlands working groups formed in different member States has been varied in the contribution to the achievement of the project objectives and goal, as well as increased in-country information and awareness-raising on wetland issues.

Exhaustive background information on the project component is to be found in e.g. the SADC/IUCN Progress Report (1 July-31 December 2002), January 2003.

5.2 Observations

5.2.1 Technical facilities

As pointed out in the Progress Report (1 July-31 December 2002), there is a significant disparity in the level of information technology (IT) competence and capacity within the countries. Computer facilities are in general available at Ministry and Department Offices; however, the support system seems to be poorly developed, implying that computers and access to Internet are down for shorter or longer periods of time. Intranet systems are, in general, poorly developed, although it has become an issue in some of the contact institutions in some of the countries. , It is not clear to the Review Team from the meetings conducted if each country in fact has a NCI.

At district and local levels IT technology is generally absent. Intranet systems are not developed, although some institutions like MICOA have a plan, which is supposed to be implemented in the near future. It was observed that none of the institutions, except for the SADC Wildlife Sector Technical Coordinator Unit, had been equipped with computers or other type of technical facilities from the project. It was observed that No training on use of technical facilities had taken place.

5.2.2 Internet as a main road for information exchange

The www.sadc-wetlands.org is still being developed, although it is already active. The design of the website is good, and characterised by professionalism. It is simple and user friendly in the sense that the front page has 6 exits to sub-site content; “Countries”, “Reports”, “Events”, “The Project”, “Contacts” and “Links”. To be a SADC website the IUCN logo is more prominent, than that of its client and for the sake of clarity this should be changed accordingly.

There was diverse knowledge of the existence of the website among those interviewed. No one had actually tried to access it, although some said, that they were aware of it. In Mozambique there was a concern with respect to the language, as the information in the website is only in English. Relatively few persons are able to read or speak English.

5.2.3 National Wetland Working Groups

Among the countries visited South Africa, Tanzania and Mozambique had active wetland working groups. The Tanzanian group had close to 30 members from both government and NGO sectors. It meets four times per year. The Working Group in Malawi that had been in existence for ten year has not had meetings since July 2002 when funding, formally provided by DANIDA, ceased. The galvanising force behind most of the Working Groups seems to have been the desire to work towards the specific goal of designating and development of potential RAMSAR sites for eventual ratification of the convention.

It was observed that at the national level the groups are regarded as formal bodies, while at district level there are in a few countries informal groups as well.

5.3 Analysis

5.3.1 Technical facilities

To make the designed IT system for information exchange efficient, a minimum of technical facilities must be in place, at least within the key institutions. The personnel should also have appropriate skills to operate these facilities. The Review Team does not support the idea of using money from the project to upgrade the institutions with technical facilities on IT or include computer training. These are fundamental assumptions, which are supposed to be in place already.

IT support must also be in place to avoid long periods where communication via e-mail and access to new information on the websites are not possible. It is important that each country and key institutions on wetland and NCI have their own websites, which are regularly updated. Experience shows that websites

that are not regularly updated lose readership fairly soon. A System Operator and IT technician is normally required in an institution to secure proper functioning of the IT facilities. This is a must in institutions with own websites and an Intranet system. The development of Intranet systems should be given priority, to secure effective and necessary, internal communication, as well as the possibility to share relevant information and coordinate ongoing activities.

To make the website sustainable after the programme period, i.e. when the SADC Secretariat in Gaborone takes over, will require regular resource input. A relatively small amount of money is an annual need for the domain name and server rental. As stressed above, continuous updating and maintenance are of outmost importance if a website is supposed to maintain its readership.

The creation of a website on wetlands for the SADC member States is strongly supported. The same conclusion also appears after the talks with institutions and organizations. The resources allocated for the Information exchange website seems, however, to be a significant overestimate. The expenses needed to create a website can be estimated to approximately US\$1,000. Assistance to some countries for creating national websites on wetlands will not negatively influence the budget. The responsibilities for the website and the functioning after the project is concluded need further discussion and clarification. There could be options either to have the website run by the SADC Secretariat or by a regional NGO or a national institution.

5.3.2 Internet as a main road for information exchange

It is generally realized and acknowledged among research and management institutions that it is necessary to tailor efficient communication and information systems based on IT solutions, to reach specific groups of interests and users. During the last years the information on specific topics has grown enormously, and become difficult or impossible to overview without IT systems, linking homesites of institutions and their metabases of data information through the World Wide Web. Thus, the wetlands website developed in the project is an obvious and necessary tool. Hopefully it will not only contribute to knowledge, but also affect attitudes and consciousness among people about the crucial role wetland ecosystems play for their own survival and welfare.

It is positive to observe that the SADC website has adapted a “modern approach” in the sense that it has no ambition of becoming a “megadatabase” for wetland information in the region. The most important function of a SADC Wetland Website will be to serve as a guide towards other wetland websites, both in each member country and to other wetland related information available on the Web. To make the system an operational, regional tool, thus requires that each country is constructing its own wetland website. So far this is not the case.

Internet does not make written information superfluous. In most SADC countries it will take many years before access to Internet is a common feature, and it is very important that written, suitable material is produced and distributed to adequate institutions and personnel at the local level.

Language problems should be assessed. Both Mozambique and Angola are Portuguese-speaking countries, thus it should be considered to make a Portuguese version of the main content of the site. As both Mauritius, Seychelles and DRC are part of SADC the need for French translations will have to be considered as well.

So far the website does not seem to have had any impact on knowledge exchange within countries and among the countries, and the available information does not seem to be utilized for the benefit of the wetland ecosystems. The overall effectiveness of the project interventions with respect to information

exchange so far seems to be negligible. However, the impact is difficult to assess at the present stage as the website has been running for a short time. In the long run it will probably come out a useful tool.

5.3.3 National Wetland Working Groups

It is difficult to assess the role and effectiveness of the national wetlands working groups in different member States and their potential input into this part of the project objective. Overview of the extracted information on working groups in the different countries is given in Annex 3. In Tanzania the Wetland Working Group seems to be an active body, and it is assessed to be of significant importance in general to the wetland activities that are taking place in the country. The overall and direct impact on the project is, however, assessed to be vague. This is also the general impression from the other countries. This may be connected to the fact that the groups seems to have been established in connection to other obligations, and particularly as a tool for the government in the processes of becoming a RAMSAR signatory or selecting RAMSAR sites.

5.4 Recommendations

The main recommendations for the Information Exchange part of the project is that

- language issues should be seriously considered based on the fact that Mozambique and Angola are Portuguese speaking countries. Both the website and written information material should appear both in English and Portuguese, and ideally also in French
- financial support should not be allocated by the project to technical facilities like computers etc., or IT training of contact institution staff
- each responsible institution in each country should have the necessary IT technical support for securing continuous access to Internet
- the SADC Secretariat in Gaborone is the natural location for the Wetlands Website after the programme has ended
- based on the observations on the costs of developing a website, IUCN should reassess the budget for the development of wetland websites.
- the project should make an initiative towards the national wetlands working groups to clarify their contribution to the national wetland programmes

6 Research Activities

6.1 Introduction

In the implementation of Wetlands Programme Phase I (1990-1991) it was discovered that the overall understanding of wetland dynamics and their socio-economic values, as well as conflicting policies and legislation, was limited in the SADC region. To address these issues, it was deemed necessary to formulate a regional research programme on wetlands. Consequently this became one of the main outputs of the Programme Phase II, i.e. identify wetlands research priority areas, and to develop a Regional Wetlands Research Programme that will enhance the region's understanding of wetlands science and dynamics.

In 2002 IUCN contracted the Institute of Water and Sanitation Development (IWSD) in Harare to develop a SADC Wetlands Conservation Research Programme. According to IWSD the methods used to collect information for developing a SADC Wetlands Conservation Research Programme included desk studies of relevant materials from the SADC-Wetlands Phase I and II projects, as well as other relevant documentation on wetlands management from both the region and outside. Visits were made to seven SADC states; namely, Malawi, Tanzania, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Botswana and

Zimbabwe. Within each country semi-structured interviews and discussions were held with representatives of key institutions (governmental and non-governmental) dealing with wetland issues. The discussions concentrated on understanding the roles and responsibilities of the institutions in general, and about wetlands in particular, policies on wetlands guiding the institutions, institutional arrangements, identification of previous and current research projects on wetlands and their link to policy, identification of key priority research issues, and the human and technical resources of the institutions.

According to IWSD substantial research has been conducted on wetlands issues, but the majority has been academic, implemented mostly through Universities, and there has been limited or no formalised arrangements of sharing the research results with policymakers. Moreover, research has been to a great extent focused on ecological issues, and less towards policy, economic and social issues.

The key research areas identified and prioritised during the consultative process with key stakeholders in the region were grouped into issues related to the following;

- policy
- legal and regulatory
- socio-economic
- environmental

The environmental issues were subdivided into *ecological*, *hydrological* and *land use*. For each of the four categories specific areas that require further research were identified. In the conclusion of the report proposes the establishment of, a SADC Wetlands Research Fund (SADC-WRF), is

Exhaustive background information on the project component is to be found in e.g. the IWSD Report (The SADC Wetlands Conservation Research Programme, February 2003) and the SADC/IUCN Progress Report (1 July-31 December 2002), January 2003.

6.2 Observations

6.2.1 Priority of wetland research areas

During the country visits, the Review Team raised the contents of the IWSD report and its findings. However, none of the respondents seems to be aware of it. This is probably due to the fact that the report has so far, not been widely distributed.

Key research areas identified during the previous in-country consultations, and confirmed through the IWSD consultative process, i.e. policy, legal and regulatory, socio-economic and environmental issues, seem to reflect the thematic areas adequate for research in the region very well. To the best knowledge of the Review Team they should also be highly relevant to the situation in each country.

In the countries visited by the Team it was reported that wetland related research takes place. However, in a regional perspective the picture is somewhat diverse, and several countries have not yet established adequate legislation and other decisive tools to coordinate and prioritise research activities.

6.2.2 Research funding

The main conclusion in the IWSD report is the establishment of a Wetland Research Fund (WRF). In most, if not all, countries visited by the Review Team there was no knowledge of neither the existing

Water Research Fund for Southern Africa (WARFSA) presently administered by IWSD, nor plans relating to an establishment of a new SADC-WRF). Due to the fact that these were completely new thoughts for most of the persons being interviewed, few expressed firm opinions about the idea. However, the main impression among the Review Team members is that the idea in general was not immediately applauded.

6.3 Analysis

6.3.1 Priority of wetland research areas

The IWSD report is unfortunately not very clear, and the conclusions somewhat surprisingly, as the main content is dealing with potential research topics identified during the data collection, but the conclusion is the establishment of a SADC-WRF. It also refers to a Technical Review Workshop in Gaborone March 5-6 (after the Policymakers workshop March 3-4), where the idea and the organisational details of a Research Fund were discussed. The Review Team has had no information on the outcome of this workshop except from what is written in the IWSD report.

It is understood, from the report that the environmental issues, subdivided into ecological, hydrological and land use issues, should be recognised as important, but not given any specific status. It is probably correct that the majority of research done in the past relate to ecological issues. It should, however, be emphasised that sufficient knowledge about the basic ecological functions and ecosystem dynamics relating to e.g. carrying capacities and species composition, is fundamental. Without the ecological and biological knowledge the management authorities are not able to take adequate actions to secure sustainability, and keep the system as a source of renewable resources for the future. *It is the water and the single organisms in the wetland system that is the resources.* Without this knowledge, there will be no future wetlands to manage. Thus, ecological and biological research should by no means be given less priority, but continue equally with other activities.

In general it is important that all research in the region related to wetland issues are supported, independent of where the initiative or the funding originates. A main point is, however, that all research and researchers should be responsible towards an adequate body in each country, i.e. research institute or university, responsible for national research co-ordination and control. It is a matter of course that all foreign researchers have local co-partners, and are obliged to give feed back to the adequate authorities on their findings before the research is finalised. The various SADC countries have diverse mechanisms with respect to this. In a country like Tanzania institutions like Wildlife Division, Tanzania Commission on Science and Technology (COSTECH) and Tanzania Wildlife Research Institute (TAWIRI), have focused on these questions and established routines which seem to be increasingly effective in preventing undesirable activities. At the same time the system invites to co-operation in a way that secures capacity building in the research institutions, and adequate dissemination of the results to management authorities at adequate levels.

The indicated options for a future Regional Wetlands Research Programme, is that it can be conducted through a combination of national research initiatives where the scope of the issue is local, or regional research initiatives where the issues are common among countries and relate to transboundary wetland systems.

To the knowledge of the Review Team, there are numerous wetland research activities going on in each SADC country, of which several also reflects the identified, research priorities. A first step would be to get an overview of all existing research activities. In the majority of the SADC countries there is a deficit of local research capacities, both with respect to human resources and funding. Although several of the

problems encountered regarding sustainable management of wetland resources with transboundary characters, it is difficult to see how a regional approach is particularly realistic when in-country qualifications and capacities in general are inadequate.

The Review Team is unconvinced to schedule a regional research programmes as a direct follow up of the present Wetland Conservation Project. This could be a premature and over ambitious task. It is difficult to see a successful implementation of a SADC Wetlands Research Programme, when each member state has a deficit in adequate research resources, i.e. capacity in research institutions and scientific personnel. As the research part of the programme can be said to have hardly started, it should be reassessed, and the objectives harmonized towards the realistic capacity of each country. Capacity building with respect to research in each country seems to be a more reasonable investment.

An option would be to assist the NCI's in each country to create an overview and a database of ongoing research activities, and operational research institutions. This would create a firm base for future evaluations of research needs, avoid research duplication, and make it possible to make realistic assessments of possibilities for research implementation. It could also be a useful exercise for the NCI, in co-operation with a research institution to assess the research topics identified in the country, make an in-country prioritization and develop research proposal for the top-ranked issue.

The rationale behind developing a SADC Research Programme is somewhat vague. In situations where RAMSAR sites, or proposed RAMSAR sites like Lake Malawi, are focused, it seems, however, reasonable that countries with shared responsibilities come together and discuss possibilities for developing joint research projects.

The Review Team would like to recognize that the term "research" could imply some misunderstandings. In a strict sense the term is used in connection to scientific work. Unfortunately in some connections the term is used analogue to terms like investigation, search, test, inquiry, examination, inspection and exploration. In connection to activities which mainly involve exploration of political processes that would improve a country's ability to sustainable management of wetland resources, it would normally not be correct to use the term "research".

6.3.2 Research funding

Research funding is always a constraint and an important factor to address to avoid unrealistic research plans. So far research in Southern Africa within this sector to a great extent has been based on funding from development aid donors and through institutional co-operations with foreign institutions, which in turn have their resources from a variety of financing sources, ranging from private funds such as National Research Councils and the EU Research Frame Programmes. The lack of funding possibilities within the region, and in the single countries, has been a serious constraint to capacity building within the research institutions. The process of developing a project proposal has for instance frequently been a task performed by the foreign researchers, with various degree of participation from the partner researchers in the target country.

The idea of a SADC Wetlands Research Fund is positive in the sense that it gives an opportunity to local researchers to initiate own research, reflecting the needs in each country. However, the region already has a similar fund through WARFSA, administered by IWSD. It is difficult to see the rationale behind the establishment of a new fund separated from the one already in place. An option would be that the existing WARFSA is advertised more widely in the SADC countries, and that the Board has members from several countries, and that assignments from the fund are equally distributed among the member countries on a quota basis.

Language problems also affect the research fund. To be of any relevance to Mozambique and Angola, all information material, Guidelines, Application forms etc. for WARFSA/ SADC-WRF should be produced both in English, Portuguese and French.

The proposed research fund will not have the capacity to secure long term funding needs. Although a regional approach to the funding is good, the bilateral cooperation between each SADC country and relevant donors in each country should be strongly considered. There are significant differences between the countries both with respect to research needs and the importance of wetlands. Signatories to the RAMSAR convention should get help to monitor the situation in their RAMSAR sites, to avoid reclassification and being put under the Montreux list.

Experience of the past strongly indicates the importance of building partnerships with many agencies and bodies to fulfil common aims and objectives. In particular this relates to funding. Particular attention should be paid to the RAMSAR sites. The development of effective, efficient and sustainable management systems that can integrate development and conservation needs to meet international, national and local community aspirations in a RAMSAR site is a tremendous task. It not only requires concerted efforts by the Government and local communities, but also donor support. To achieve the goals and the wise use of a RAMSAR site, and meet the country's obligations to the RAMSAR Convention in general requires assistance in a long-term perspective (probably 10-15 years).

6.4 Recommendations

The main recommendations for the Research Component of the project is that

- to develop a regional research programmes as such seems to be a premature task
- there should be a refocus from regional to national wetlands research
- the national focal institution on wetland issues should be facilitated to get an overview of all existing research activities. A national database over on-going research activities, as well as research institution should be established, and accessible from www.sadc-wetlands.org.
- the establishment of a SADC Wetlands Research Fund as proposed in the IWSD is not supported

7 Other issues

7.1 Institutions

7.1.1 Introduction

In Phase I of the SADC Wetlands conservation Project it was recognized that in order to effectively promote, coordinate and implement conservation a number of institutional arrangements had to be put in place. These arrangements had to be seen to be operational at three levels - viz: regional, national and community level. Over the years attempts have been made to put in place such organizational structures at these various levels.

The implementation arrangements for this programme were left largely as the responsibility of IUCN•ROSA. To this end the human and technical resources at IUCN•ROSA devoted to this programme are a subject for this assessment.

7.1.2. Observations

At the regional level, the main structures that have been dealing with wetlands and related issues have been found in such organizations as NEPAD, SADC, IUCN, WWF to name but a few. Until recently SADC was organized into specific key sectors and the coordination of these allocated to individual countries. Hence wetlands fell under the natural resources sector, which was coordinated by the Wildlife Sector Technical Coordination Unit, housed in the Department of National Parks and Wildlife of Malawi. However, in the recently announced re-structuring of SADC this sector's coordination will be managed by the SADC Directorate of Food Agriculture and Natural Resources based in Gaborone, Botswana. The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) also urges the inclusion of wetland conservation and wise use as a thematic area under its Environment Initiative.

There have been other regional initiatives that have been dealing with wetland issues in their programmes. These include the likes of the Zambezi River Action Plan-Integrated Water Resource Management. However, as at the national and sub-national levels, there is no single institution with the mandate to manage wetlands as a specific and singular responsibility. It is still too early to assess the effectiveness of the newly re-organised SADC FANR Directorate in implementation of wetland management mandate.

The national level coordination of wetland affairs is characterized by fragmentation of responsibility between various ministries, departments and non-governmental structures. This has led to tensions and conflicts of development interests. Attempts to rectify the anomaly have been reported in Zambia, Mozambique and Botswana, where agencies with the mandate to coordinate wetland initiatives have been created, but these have not yet fully resolved the conflicts at the national levels.

Other notable structures that have been observed as crucial in the management of wetlands have been the various "wetland committees", or "working groups". In a number of the countries, as stated earlier the formation of the groups has been facilitated by the process of acceding to the RAMSAR Conventions, which allows the integration of multi-stake holder involvement. In some countries, however, these committees have remained only on paper and others have fizzled out, after initial donor funding of the process has come to an end, whilst other countries have reported successes.(e.g. Tanzania and South Africa).

The greatest challenge has also come from attempts at creating sub-national structures to ensure sustainable management of wetlands. These have involved organizing communities, usually of the direct beneficiaries of the resources found in wetlands, such as fish, wildlife, lands and bird life. Some successes were recorded in such localities as Lake Chilwa in Malawi where bird groups are responsible for looking after the fauna around the site.

In most of the countries, however, none of the structures, particularly those outside of the government systems, have any legal status and as such, their ability to enforce some of the management requirements in natural resources use is severely compromised. For instance, in the sub-regional level, incursion into the wetland areas by non-project groups is often a source of conflict which local committees are not able to resolve through legal provisions.

The challenge to empower the community level management structures, through training is still very huge and needs to be urgently addressed if wetland management will take root in earnest.

7.1.3 Assessment of PIU Capabilities

Within the IUCN•ROSA offices the Wetlands Programme budget provided for a Project Coordinator assisted by Project Secretary who are supposed to be fully devoted to running of this phase of the programme. IUCN•ROSA is supposed to provide other "technical backstopping" to the programme on the

behest of the Project-Coordinator. From the interviews with other technical officers of the regional office the Review Team had the impression that their involvement and appreciation of the deeper complexities in the programme was somewhat limited. Considerable and commendable work has been achieved by the PIU despite the human resource limitations

7.1.4 Analysis

At national level, the setting up of government ministries is often not directed by technical and professional competencies but largely by political considerations. This has compromised, eventually, management of such fields as wetlands. Decentralisation of authority to lower structures has been rather slow, non-existent or underdeveloped in most of the countries.

The human resources devoted to this programme, at IUCN•ROSA seem to have been underestimated at the time of project formulation given the magnitude of the tasks .The Project Coordinator has to ensure the activities of eleven countries are carried out, and at the same time devote time to activities in the IUCN•ROSA-this imposes some considerable pressure on the small PIU.

7.1.5 Recommendations

The main recommendations for Institutions is that

- review PIU human resources by considering appointment of a Project assistant
- establish a dialogue with a relevant Norwegian institution to enhance capacity and serve as a discussion partner and adviser to the project
- establish and maintain a data base of technical expertise and availability to provide technical assistance to both regional and national initiatives in such areas as research, education, policy formulation, legislation, planning, management and training, to mention but a few
- Policymaker Workshops should continually be held in order to foster professional viewpoints on wetlands and related issues
- coordinating structures such as Working Committees or Groups should be facilitated by coverage in relevant legislation and funding arrangements made for their sustainability such as sitting allowances to ensure regular participation
- in the case of the community level groups incentives of economic returns such as promoted in the CBRNM concepts should be encouraged for the benefit of wetland management as well.

7.2 Monitoring and Evaluation

7.2.1 Introduction

The SADC Wetlands Conservation Project Phase II is being implemented in some 11 countries of the region. It is therefore deemed important to continually inform all the stakeholders of the progress, challenges and successes met in the execution of the project. A monitoring and evaluation plan was designed by the PIU at IUCN•ROSA. It was meant to inform the client agency SADC Wildlife Sector Technical Coordinating Unit in Malawi, who in turn, regularly report to the Wildlife Technical Committee.

The Monitoring and Evaluation Plan is in place at IUCN•ROSA.

7.2.2 Observations

It was not clear to the Review Team, how much consultation was done on the development of the M&E plan (July 2002), with the client agency SADC-WSTCU and the governments of the region. What is evident, however, is that written reporting on a regular basis does not seem to be the norm between the various stakeholders.

The plan, which was initially, being undertaken through IUCN•ROSA's internal M&E, has since been handled by the PIU itself. It contains some noble goals and how to verify the attainment of these. It is also honest enough to recognize that although physical targets can be enumerated there are problems with measuring "effectiveness" of certain activities in attaining the overall goal of sustainable wetland management.

The plan's logical framework seems not to have taken elements of specificity when it comes "tying times to the outcomes" and as such the assessment of the activities' performance lacks this aspect. For instance it is not clear when the indicator "workshop reports and attendance lists for the 4 wetlands sites" will be made available or how often these will be evaluated in the course of the three-year implementation period.

7.2.3 Analysis

It is therefore, not surprising that the training workshops reports were not readily available at the Coordinating officers during the time of the review.

7.2.4 Recommendation

The main recommendations for the Monitoring Component of the project is that

- the Monitoring and Evaluation plan has to be agreed and followed by the key stakeholders

7.3 Gender issues

It is observed that gender issues pertaining to utilisation and conservation of wetlands are among the research areas identified. The division of labour and responsibilities in general, differs based on gender. Women are frequently disadvantaged in terms of access to land, natural resources, labour and capital as well as to decision-making processes. The recognition of this is important so that greater equity can be achieved and lead to improved access to information, services, and resources and decision-making. The programme will need to fully investigate the gender aspects of access to, and rights concerning, resources and decision making in wetland management. Future models developed for participatory planning should be evaluated to ensure the effective participation of women. Women should also be specifically targeted for awareness raising concerning all aspects of the wetland programme, ecology of the area, impact of resource use and especially legal aspects related to land and their rights; training activities linked to programme objectives and outputs; and for equitable representation in meetings and representative bodies. The programme should also identify micro-projects that can demonstrate the role of women in sustainable natural resource management.

The role of gender in wetland management was included in one of the courses covered on Conflict Management and Participatory Approaches in Lesotho.

References

- Breen, C.M & N.W.Quinn and J.J.Mander: Wetlands Conservation and Management in Southern Africa: Challenges and Opportunities. Summary of the SADC Wetlands Conservation Survey Reports. IUCN 1997.
- SADC Regional Wetlands Conservation Project: Revised Project Document. IUCN ROSA in collaboration with SADC WSTCU, October 2001.
- SADC Regional Wetlands Conservation Project: Progress Report, 01 July 2001 - 30 June 2002. IUCN•ROSA in collaboration with SADC WSTCU, June 2002.
- SADC Regional Wetlands Conservation Project: Regional Policy Makers Seminar - Draft report. IUCN•ROSA in collaboration with SADC FANR. March 2003.
- International Water Management Institute: Water and Sustainable Development in Africa; An African Position Paper
- The Institute of Water and Sanitation Development: The SADC Wetlands Conservation Research Programme. February 2003.

Annexes

Annex 1. Mid-Term Review Programme. Team 1: Kjetil Bevanger / Joshua Nyoni. Team 2: Svein Aage Mehli.

Date	Departure	Arrival	Activity
Day 1 Monday 19.05.2003		Lilongwe arrival	Meeting: 14:30-16:30 with <i>Per Mogstad</i> First Secretary at the Norwegian Embassy, Lilongwe
Day 2 Tuesday 20.05.2003	16:00 Lilongwe departure to Harare	19:00 Johannesburg Overnight in Johannesburg	Meetings: 09:00-11:00 with <i>Per Mogstad</i> First Secretary and <i>Ramosh Jiah</i> , Deputy Director, Head of SADC Wildlife Unit, SADC Wildlife Sector Technical Coordinator Unit
Day 3 Wednesday 21.05.2003		Arrival Harare at 12:30	Meeting: 14:00-18:00 with <i>Lenka N. Thamae</i> , Wetlands Project Coordinator, IUCN•ROSA Office.
Day 4 Thursday 22.05.2003			Meetings: 09:00-10:00 with <i>Lenka Thamae</i> IUCN•ROSA Office 10:00-11:30 with <i>Ebenizário Chonguica</i> ; Regional Programme Coordinator 11:30-12:30 with <i>Genius Maguma</i> , Assistant Accountant. 14:00-15:00 with <i>Tabeth Matiza-Chiuta</i> , Water Programme Coordinator
Day 5 Friday 23.05.2003			Meetings: 09:00-11:00 with <i>Jerry Ndamba</i> , Research and Information Manager and <i>Gift Manase</i> at The Institute of Water and Sanitation Development Office 14:00 with <i>Maxwell Maturure</i> , Senior Natural Research officer, Dep. of Natural Resources
Day 6 Team 1 Saturday 24.05.2003	07:15 Harare Departure	16:00 Arrival Maputo	Report preparation.
Day 6 Team 2 Saturday 24.05.2003	10:20 Harare Departure	14:00 Arrival Gaborone	Report preparation
Day 7 Team 1 Sunday 25.05.2003			Report preparation.
Day 7 Team 2 Sunday 25.05.2003			Report preparation
Day 8 Team 1 Monday 26.05.2002			Meetings: 08:30-09:15 with <i>Marta Monjane</i> , Programme Officer, IUCN Office 09:30 10:30 with <i>Samiro Magane</i> , Head of Department of Fauna (DNFFB) 10:45-11:45 with <i>Anselmo Gaspar</i> , Head of Department of Coastal Zone Management (MICOA) 14:30-15:30 with <i>Helena Motta</i> , Programme Officer, WWF 19:00-19:30 with <i>Karen Lise Jensen</i> , Junior Professional Officer, IUCN
Day 8 Team 2 Monday 26.05.2002			Meetings: 09:00-11:00 with Mr. <i>Stepen Nanthambwe</i> , Environment expert, Mr. <i>Manuel Enock</i> , Forestry

Final Report/Mid-Term Review SADC RWCP Phase II

			and wildlife expert, SADC FANR Directorate, Gaborone 14:30-1700 with Mr. David Aniku, Ms. Wame Hambira, Ms. Mokgadi Monamati, Mr. Steven Monna, NCSA, Department of Wildlife and Tourism, Gaborone
Day 9 Team 1 Tuesday 27.05.2003	07:00 Maputo Departure		Meeting: 15:15-16:30 with Charles Mdowe, Ass. Director W.D, Lars Dinesen, DANIDA Advisor, Mzamiru Kaita, Matthew Maige, Abdara S. Mwanauta, Nollasco Ngowe, all Wildlife Division, Wetland Office, MNRT;
Day 9 Team 2 Monday 27.05.2003	14:30 Gaborone Departure	15:30 Johannesburg Arrival	Meeting: 09:00-11:00 with Mr. Daniel E. C. Mughogho, Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Gaborone
Day 10 Team 1 Tuesday 28.05.2003			Meetings: 08:00-09:15 with Peter K. Chisara, NEMC 09:30-10:45 with Chikambi K. Rumisha, Marine Parks and Reserves 19:00-20:30 with Aggrey J.D.Ambali (Executive director), Wisdom Changadeya (Laboratory Manager), George Mwale (Field Manager) and Lawrence Malekano (Projects Manager), all BioEROC (Biotechnology – Ecology Research of Outreach Consortium) – formerly MBERU
Day 10 Team 2 Wednesday 28.05.2003	06:30 Johannesburg Departure	12:20 Dar es Salaam Departure	16:00 Arrival Blantyre
Day 10 Team 2 Wednesday 28.05.2003		08:00 Maseru Arrival	Meetings: 09:00-10:30 with Mr. Mokare Mojakisane, Director, Ms. Limpho Motanya, Officer Wetlands Unit, Department of Water Affairs, 14:00-15:15 with Ms. Matseliso, lecturer, Mr. Lehlohouolo Moeti, Senior lecturer, Mr. Mothutsi Mokhothu, Head of Geography Department, Mr. Qalabane K. Chakela, Professor, Department of Geography, University of Lesotho
Day 11 Team 1 Thursday 29.05.2003	13:00 Blantyre Departure	14:00 Arrival Lilongwe	Meetings: 08:30-10:00 (BioEROC – same personnel as 28.05) 14:30-14:45 with Deputy Director, Head of SADC Wildlife Unit Ramosh Jiah, SADC Wildlife Sector Technical Coordinator Unit 14:45-14:45 with Mary Chilimampungu, Parks and Wildlife Officer at DNPW
Day 11 Team 2 Thursday 29.05.2003	08:00 Maseru Departure	09:30 Johannesburg Arrival	Meetings: 11:30-1300 with Ms. Wilma Lutsch, Deputy Director, Mr. John Dini, Ass. Director Conservation Management, Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Pretoria 14:00-16:30 with Mr. David Lindley, Mondl Wetlands Project, Project Manager
Day 12 Team 1 Friday 30.05.2002			Meetings: 13:45-14:30 with Roy Bhima, Director of Research, DNPW 14:45-15:30 with Leonard D. Sefu, Director DNPW
Day 12 Team 2 Friday 30.05.2002			Report preparation
Day 13 Saturday 31.05.2003	13:00 Johannesburg Departure (Team 2)	15:30 Lilongwe Arrival (Team 2)	Report preparation
Day 14 Sunday 01.06.2003			Report preparation
Day 15			Report preparation

Final Report/Mid-Term Review SADC RWCP Phase II

Monday 02.06.2003			
Day 16 Tuesday 03.06.2003			Report preparation
Day 17 Wednesday 04.06.2003			Report preparation
Day 18 Thursday 05.06.2003			11:00 13:00 Annual Meeting
Day 19 Friday 06.05.2003	13:35 Lilongwe		Leave Malawi

Annex 2. Terms of Reference

IUCN The World Conservation Union

SADC REGIONAL WETLANDS CONSERVATION PROJECT PHASE II

Final Draft

Terms of References for the Project Mid-term Review

IUCN REGIONAL OFFICE FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA

In Collaboration With

SADC Directorate for Food Agriculture and Natural Resources

March 2003

1.0 PROJECT SUMMARY

1.1 Project title: SADC REGIONAL WETLANDS CONSERVATION PROJECT
PHASE II.

1.2 Implementing agency: IUCN Regional Office for Southern Africa in collaboration with the SADC Directorate for Food Agriculture and Natural Resources.

1.3 Project design

The SADC region supports a diversity of wetland ecosystems that include inter-tidal and sub-tidal marine systems, estuarine systems, lakes (natural and man made), riverine systems, floodplains, swamps, marshes and dambos. Wetland ecosystems are some of the most productive natural ecosystems in the region. They provide freshwater for human consumption, pasture for livestock, fertile soils for agriculture, yield a major harvest of fish protein and support important populations of wildlife. In fact, the wetland ecosystems of Southern Africa have the largest species diversity in the region. However, despite this importance of wetlands to mankind and animals, these ecosystems are increasingly being lost and degraded due to lack of conservation and proper management. This is a consequence of the fact that despite the importance of wetlands to the livelihoods of the people and the ecology of the region, wetland issues are still not prominent on the policy agendas of the countries in the region.

Most of the region's wetland ecosystems are shared therefore achieving sustainable wetland conservation and management requires regional co-operation, an integrated/ecosystem approach and a common understanding of the wetlands and associated natural resource base. A regional and ecosystems management approach to addressing the above issues is essential because of the transboundary nature of the major categories of the wetlands in the region.

The overall objective of the project is to enhance the technical capacity of SADC member states and relevant partners to design and implement effective measures required for the conservation and sustainable use of wetland ecosystems in Southern Africa. This will be achieved through the establishment and execution of short term training courses in various critical aspects of wetland conservation and management; encouragement and facilitation of cross boundary interactions and exchange of information, and the provision of technical backstopping to undertake detailed analytical inventories of wetlands, and the facilitation of the formulation of wetland management plans (with special emphasis on transboundary wetland systems).

The project's approach is to build upon activities initiated in Phase I and complement the related activities initiated by IUCN, SADC-ELMS and other institutions. Of particular importance are the IUCN/CIDA Zambezi Basin Wetlands Conservation and Resource Utilisation Programme, SADC-ELMS ZACPLAN, IWRB/South African initiative on Wetlands Management Training Programme for Southern Africa, and many others. The programmatic approach outlined in this project document is primarily intended to increase wetlands awareness, strengthen the capacities of SADC member states in the field of wetlands conservation and management and promote transboundary management of the wetlands in the region.

As outlined above, a number of related initiatives on wetland conservation and management are being implemented. However, the region lacks (at a regional scale) an ecosystems approach to wetlands conservation and management.

This project aims at promoting a regional ecosystems approach to wetlands conservation, which in essence provides an ecologically meaningful spatial framework in which to work. This is envisaged to ultimately result in a co-ordination framework for wetland conservation and management efforts in the region.

The SADC Wetlands Conservation Project Phase II is a regional project that serves all the SADC Member States. The main beneficiaries of the project are SADC member states i.e. Angola, Namibia, Botswana, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Malawi, Lesotho, Swaziland, Tanzania, South Africa, and Mozambique. The three members of the regional grouping, SADC namely, Democratic Republic of Congo, Mauritius and Seychelles, which joined SADC when the project funding arrangements were already finalised, have also been incorporated into the main activities of the project. Project activities operate at regional and sub-regional/ecosystem levels. The successes and experiences of this project will contribute to the general conservation and wise use of natural resources in Southern Africa as well as regional co-operation.

2.0 TERMS OF REFERENCES

2.1 Background

The SADC Wetlands Conservation Project Phase II mainly focuses on building capacity among member States, on the wise-use and conservation of wetlands and their related resources. The project seeks to address the challenges of lack of capacity through training, information exchange and demonstrating the development of wetland management plans.

The training component of the project, comprising of four six week training seminars on wetland dynamics and integrated management techniques (palustrine, riverine, estuarine and marine wetland systems), a four week training course on wetland conflicts and participatory approaches, and a training workshop on wetland management planning is being implemented through collaboration with regional training institutions pre-selected by member States. The training is targeted at wetland Managers from SADC countries. The expected outputs from this component are that 36 to 60 wetland ecosystems managers, planners and policy makers from member States of SADC are trained on the values or wetland s and related resources, and that training material and courses are developed in regional natural resources training institutions.

Information exchange under the project is being realized through the establishment of a regional wetlands information system based on an assessment of the available information, data and relevant contacts within member States. A web site is being established to provide electronic guidance to key sources of wetlands data and information, and to disseminate products of the wetlands project. This component will be complemented by the development of a regional wetlands research programme addressing priority wetland research needs identified by SADC member States. Expected outputs from the information exchange and research programme as outlined in the project document are: one round table technical meeting for policy makers, planners and wetland managers; a regional wetlands information exchange framework supported by national information networks; and a regional programme proposal on priority research areas on wetlands.

The component on demonstrating the development of wetland management plans is expected to produce four conservation and wise-use management plans for representative wetland types found in the SADC region. The project is utilizing four wetlands namely; the Makgadikgadi palustrine system (Botswana), the Pungwe riverine system (Zimbabwe to Mozambique), the Zambezi estuarine system (Mozambique) and the marine wetland located between the Rufiji Delta and Mafia Island (Tanzania) as representative

wetland systems within the categories being addressed. Selection of the wetland systems was through a consultation with officials from member States.

Implementation of the SADC Wetlands Conservation Project Phase II commenced in 2001, with the establishment of a Project Implementation Unit, within IUCN•ROSA. The project started first with undertaking in-country consultations; to reaffirm priorities identified in the project, re-establish a network of project contact institutions, and to raise awareness of the project activities in general. This process culminated in a regional consultative meeting that adopted the project approach, selected demonstration sites, and identified collaborating institutions for implementation of various activities within the project. The main product of the meeting was the final project document guiding implementation of the project.

Wetlands wise-use and conservation is a relatively new concept within the SADC region, and most actions addressing this issue are principally guided by global norms and principles developed under the Ramsar Convention. On the other hand wetland degradation and in particular conflicts balancing utilization and maintenance of key functions of wetlands continue to threaten the existence of these important ecosystems. SADC member States have therefore expressed substantial support for efforts under the project, although there is concern that the project will produce a rather small number of trained technical manpower for the region. This concern was also echoed by the First Project Annual Meeting among the SADC Wildlife Sector Coordinating Unit, NORAD and IUCN, held in Lilongwe, Malawi, April 2002.

The First Project Annual Meeting recognized that visibility and effective impact of the project will be realized through concerted efforts by member States, to support further dissemination of skills and techniques gathered through the project activities. Hence, the capacity building approach emphasized under the project is that of training of trainers. Material developed for the regional training is structured for easy and practical use and dissemination by participants. This of course hinges strongly on the resources provided to the participants on return to their respective countries and institutions, the overall coordinating capacity of the national institution responsible for wetland management, and the availability of supporting institutional mechanisms to effect change on the wetlands and communities relying on them.

The Annual Meeting recommended that in order to assess the effectiveness of the approach adopted by the project, reinforce commitment by member States and to evaluate the impact of the project at regional and national levels, a mid-term review should be conducted. The review will be undertaken under the overall framework of project monitoring and evaluation and may recommend review of outputs, change in approach and/or more emphasis on aspects of the activity plan.

2.2 Purpose of the Mid-Term Review

The purpose of the mid-term review is to provide an objective assessment of the project, its implementation and implementation arrangements in relation to the project goal, objectives and expected outputs. The review will also assess existing and planned products of the project in relation to the target audience and their impact. The review will then identify opportunities for improving performance of the project and advance recommendations to guide implementation of the second half of the project.

2.3 Issues to be addressed by the Mid-Term Review

The mid-term review will assess overall performance of the project in relation to the goal, objective and expected outputs under each of the three components. The role of the different stakeholders namely the funding agency NORAD, SADC, the Project implementing Unit at IUCN•ROSA and member States will be reviewed with the objective of streamlining and proving more focus towards achievement of the project objective.

2.3.1 Capacity Building

The mid-term review will determine the level to which the project has achieved the outputs set out in the project document in relation to capacity building. At the time of the review the project will have completed three training courses, one training workshop and will have held the policy makers seminar. The review will specifically interview participants who took part in these events and assess the level of acquisition of intended skills, support provided for further dissemination of these skills at the national level, and any impact that the interventions have had, thus far on management of wetlands in the SADC member States. The member States to be visited will be required to provide evidence under each of the achievements.

2.3.2 Information Exchange and Research

The project document highlighted that there is limited exchange of information, on wetlands within and among SADC member States. This situation has been addressed firstly through convening of national and regional consultative meetings, through the training courses and workshop, the regional policy makers seminar, and through the establishment of a regional wetlands website www.sadc-wetlands.org . In addition the project will be assisting member States strengthen their national networks through provision of electronic facilities, and/or training of individuals on the use of the facilities where appropriate.

The mid-term review will assess the effectiveness of project interventions already in place, the impact that the different events have had on knowledge exchange within countries and among the countries, and whether the available information is being utilized for the benefit of the wetland ecosystems. The role and effectiveness of national wetlands working groups formed in different member States will be assessed to determine their potential input into the project objective and goal.

The mid-term review will also reflect on the priority wetland research areas, to assess their relevance to the situation in the countries, and how the research can optimally contribute to policy formulation. The regional wetlands research programme can be conducted through a combination of national research initiatives where the scope of the issue is local and regional research initiatives, where the issues are common among countries or relate to transboundary wetland systems. The review will assess the effectiveness of this approach and make appropriate recommendations. The review will also reflect on funding for the research programme proposal.

2.3.4 Management Planning

The development of demonstration wetland management plans requires that the member State where the site is located is committed to the process, owns the management planning exercise and ensures its relevance to the specific site selected. These have been the principles upon which the demonstration component has been underpinned.

The mid-term review will assess, not only progress achieved thus far in relation to the development of the demonstration management plans, but also the level of commitment of the member States involved.

Ownership of the process will be reflected by the level of engagement of the officials in the process, inclusion of the process in their normal workplans and recurrent budget, and rigorous follow-up on steps required for completion of the work.

2.4 Tasks to performed

2.4.1 Review of Background Information

The mid-term review will include a review of background information available at the Project Implementation Unit, SADC and NORAD. Other related/complementary activity reports will be identified during field visits to member States in SADC.

Background information available within the project includes:

- Reports from SADC Wetlands Conservation Project Phase I,
- Reports on complementary activities and initiatives undertaken by individual member States,
- The SADC Wetlands Conservation Phase II Project Document,
- Project plans,
- Progress reports,
- Project monitoring and evaluation plan,
- Specific activity reports, and
- Training resource manual.

2.4.2 Interviewing key stakeholders

Implementation of the project is a collaborative effort among SADC, IUCN and SADC member States. The cooperating partner NORAD is involved in overseeing project delivery and financial stability. Other collaborating agencies and specialist teams including training institutions, consultants and regional institutions are engaged in specific activities as required.

The mid-term review will seek opinion and views of the widest spectrum of key stakeholders. The following list includes some of the stakeholders to be targeted during the review process:

- a. SADC Secretariat: Directorate of Food Agriculture and Natural Resources (Gaborone, Botswana).
- b. Department of National Parks and Wildlife (Lilongwe, Malawi).
- c. The Royal Norwegian Embassy, Lilongwe, Malawi.
- d. IUCN Regional Office for Southern Africa, Harare, Zimbabwe.
- e. Project National Contact Institutions and beneficiaries in Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa, Tanzania and Zimbabwe.

The mid-term review will be enriched by input from complementary regional initiatives being undertaken by IUCN and other development agencies. It is also expected that if possible the review team should attend one of the project technical or official meetings that may coincide with the review process.

2.4.3 Analysis and Reporting

Final Report/Mid-Term Review SADC RWCP Phase II

The Review Team will compile their findings, analyse them, produce a draft set of recommendations and compile a preliminary report. The preliminary report will be presented to SADC, NORAD, and IUCN•ROSA for their input and initial comment.

The review team will incorporate the input and comments in a draft final report to be submitted to SADC, NORAD and IUCN•ROSA. The Project Implementation Unit (IUCN•ROSA) will be responsible for distributing the draft final report among SADC member States for their comments.

The final report incorporating final comments of SADC, NORAD, IUCN•ROSA, and Project National Contact Points will be compiled by the Review Team and a final submission made to IUCN•ROSA.

2.5 Outputs

Outputs of the review exercise will include:

- Preliminary report.
- Draft final report.
- Final report.

The following report structure is recommended for all the outputs listed above:

- Introduction and purpose of the mid-term review.
- Review approach.
- Review findings.
- Assessment of project progress towards the goal, objectives, outputs.
- Assessment of project impact and visibility including challenges and opportunities.
- Assessment of project implementation arrangements (regional and national)
- Recommendations.

3.0 MID-TERM REVIEW TEAM

SADC and the Project Implementation Unit will identify two consultants from the SADC region to undertake the review. Selection will be through direct contact and submission of proposals.

NORAD will also identify two consultants from Norway to form part of the Review Team. This is in line with the agreed approach at the Project Annual Review meeting, April 2002.

4.0 WORK-PLAN

Activity		City & Country	Institution	Number of days
1. Mobilization (17-18 May)				1
2. Briefing (19 May)		Lilongwe, Malawi	NORAD, National Parks and Wildlife	1
3. Briefing, desktop study and interviews (20-23 May)		Harare, Zimbabwe	IUCN•ROSA, IWSD	3
4. Consultations: (26-30 May)	Team 1	Gaborone, Botswana	SADC FANR Directorate, NCSA, Department of Wildlife and Tourism, IUCN Botswana.	2
		Maseru, Lesotho	Department of Water	1

Final Report/Mid-Term Review SADC RWCP Phase II

			Affairs, Department of Geography (National University of Lesotho)	
		Pretoria and Cape Town (SA)	DEAT, Mondi Wetlands, University of Cape Town	2
	Team 2	Maputo, Mozambique	MICOA, DNFFB, GTA, WWF, IUCN Mozambique	1
		Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania	Wildlife Division, National Environment Management Council	1
		Lilongwe & Zomba, Malawi	National Parks and Wildlife, MBERU	2
5. Preparation of 1 st Draft report – Lilongwe (1-4 June)				3
6. Incorporation of comments from SADC, IUCN and NORAD to produce draft final report.				3
7. Incorporation of comments from SADC member States and production of final report				3
Total				19

5.0 BUDGET

Item	Rate (approx.) USD	Quantity	Approx. Cost USD
1. Professional fees:			
1a. Regional consultants (2)	250/day	19 x 2	9,500.00
1b. Norwegian consultants (2)	-	19 x 2	-
2. Regional Travel:			
2a. Air tickets (4 consultants)	600	4	2,400.00
2b. Subsistence (4 consultants)	130	19 x 4	9,880.00
3. International Travel			
3a. Oslo-Lilongwe-Oslo (2)	3,300	2	6,600.00
3. Reimbursable costs:			
3a. Local Travel			500.00
3b. Communication			200.00
3c. Secretarial support			200.00
3d. Report production			200.00
4. Subtotal			28,180.00
5. Contingency (5%)			1,409.00
Total			29,589.00

Note: The professional fees for the consultants from Norway will be determined and paid by NORAD directly.

6.0 MID-TERM REVIEW AND PROJECT ANNUAL MEETING DATES

The mid-term review is expected to commence on the commence on the 19th May 2003 with briefing sessions in Lilongwe Malawi. The consultants will then proceed onto Harare, Zimbabwe to hold consultations with IUCN•ROSA who host the Project Implementation Unit and the Institute for Water and Sanitation Development, one of the institutions that collaborated with IUCN•ROSA on project implementation.

It is expected that country consultations and production of a draft report will be completed by the 4th of June 2003. The consultants will submit the draft report, which

will then become part of the agenda for the project Annual Meeting Scheduled for the 9th June 2003 in Lilongwe, Malawi.

ANNEX 3. Progress in SADC Region on Wetland Management outcomes

Country	Status on Ramsar Convention	Wetland policy status	Lead agency	Presence of National Working group	Other remarks
Angola	Not yet	Nil	Environment	Not yet?	
Botswana	Signed	Draft stage	NCSA(Env)	Has a reference group	
Lesotho	In the process of signing.	Nil	Water Affairs	Not yet	
Malawi	Signed Designated site is L.Chilwa on 14/11/1996	Nil	Wildlife/Env	Working group now not operational due "lack of funds"	Have a sitting allowance
Mauritius	Signed	Nil	Agriculture	?	
Mozambique	In the process of signing. May be October-November 2003	Not yet in place	MICOA/Env	Informal committee led by MICOA	Have a sitting allowance
Namibia	Signed, Designated sites include Walvis Bay, Sandwich Harbour Etosha Pan(1995)	Nil	MET	Functioning working group	
Swaziland	Not yet	Nil	SNTC (Wildlife)	?	
South Africa	Signed, 16 sites designated	?	DEAT	Informal working group	
Tanzania	In the process of signing-has 3 sites designated	Has a Wildlife Policy under revision since 1998. Currently working on a wetland strategy	Wildlife/Env	Formal Working group of 30 stakeholders that meets quarterly	Have a sitting allowance
Zambia	Signed, designated sites include Kafue Flats, Lochnivar & Blue Lagoon	In place	Env Council of Zambia	Working group	Have a sitting allowance
Zimbabwe	Not yet	Nil	MET(DNR)	?	
DRC	Not yet?	Nil?	?	?	