

Evaluation Abstract

Title, author and date of the evaluation report:

Tanga Coastal Zone Conservation and Development Programme, End of Phase III Evaluation
EARO/75969/801, prepared by Dr. Alec Dawson Shepherd, Eamonn Brehony, Harold Mongi and
Veronica Muthui, September 2003

Name of project, programme or organizational unit:

Tanga Coastal Zone Conservation and Development Programme (TCZCDP), IUCN Eastern Africa
Regional Office (EARO)

Objectives of the project, programme or mandate of the organizational unit:

Overall goal of Phase III: "Integrity of the Tanga coastal zone ecosystem improved and its resources supporting sustainable development"

Purpose: "Improved coastal zone resources management by district administration, resource users and other stakeholders"

Results: 1) Improved capacity of key stakeholders and local institutions for coastal zone resources management, conservation and monitoring; 2) Coastal/marine resources management plans developed, implemented and monitored; 3) Key stakeholders aware of coastal zone management issues and values and using information to improve management; 4) Programme effectively managed, monitored and evaluated.

IUCN area of specialisation: Coastal and Marine

Geographical area: Tanzania

Project or programme duration, length of existence of organisational unit:

Phase I (1994-1997); Phase II (1997-2000); Phase III (under evaluation): (2001-2003)

Overall budget of the project, programme or organizational unit:

USD 2,117,900 (Phase III)

Donor(s): Ireland Aid

Objectives of the evaluation:

1. Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of programme implementation;
2. Determine the relevance of the programme in relation to the existing needs of the stakeholders and environment;
3. Evaluate the impacts of the program and the contribution of outputs to the overall program goal;
4. Assess the long-term sustainability of the programme interventions; and
5. Identify lessons learned on the programme strategic approach (processes and mechanisms chosen to achieve programme results).

Type of evaluation: End-of-phase project evaluation

Period covered by the evaluation: 2001-2003

Commissioned by: Ireland Aid

Audience: Ireland Aid, IUCN/EARO, Project Team

Evaluation team: Mixed internal/external

Methodology used:

The evaluation was undertaken by a four-person team and took place over a ten-day period in June 2003.

The methodological approach comprised of:

1. A review of all relevant documentation
2. Finalization of the key questions to determine the effectiveness, efficiency, impact, relevance and sustainability of the Tanga Project.
3. Interviews and discussions with all key stakeholders involved in the Project.
4. Field visits to relevant project sites.

Questions of the evaluation:

The evaluation sought to assess whether Project had:

1. Raised awareness of and changed attitudes towards natural resources use and management;
2. Improved management practices;
3. Created alternative and sustainable means of supporting livelihoods to reduce pressure on marine resources;
4. Created a social capital – a legacy that will ensure sustainability.

Findings:

The TCZCDP was assessed as relevant, effective, efficient, and having high positive impact with regard to the evaluation questions listed above. Specifically,

- Curriculum development and other dissemination activities have built understanding of the need for natural resources management;
- Stakeholders clearly feel that, with focused assistance in key technical areas, they have the management capability to sustain the programme's legacy;
- Income Generation/Alternative Income Generation is highly relevant to the needs of stakeholders;
- The programme has been effective in creating goodwill and understanding through using a highly participatory approach.

The Programme's strengths are seen as lying in a strong social capital reflected in stakeholder commitment to and basic understanding of natural resources management. Weaknesses include the rate of social change needed to support the sharing of these resources and the assigning of responsibility and accountability for managing them. The threat, other than that of an uncertain world, is whether social change and the associated process of allocating resources to collaborative management can be sufficiently consolidated within the time available to ensure a reasonable chance of sustainability.

Recommendations:

- Continue the programme through a fourth three-year phase;
- Focus on improving government service to collaborating management area communities (civil rights education, line charters, advocacy and legal redress);
- Strengthen understanding of the collaborative nature of management areas;
- Simplify the logframe and monitoring & evaluation system;
- Consider meshing management area boundaries with district boundaries, where administratively efficient and not adversely impacting the ecological integrity;
- Secure sustainable financing to continue key activities;
- Support sustainable livelihoods as part of the programme;
- Identify risks from population increase and climate change, and make recommendations.

Lessons Learned:

- The ‘pilot’ village approach may not be suitable for areas where large numbers of villages use the same resource.
- Involving women is essential and increases chances of success.
- Capacity building after decentralization took longer than anticipated, and training needs to be directed at all stakeholders, not just personnel directly involved in programme implementation.
- By reducing monitoring costs, participatory monitoring is an invaluable tool to work towards financial sustainability. It is also an instrument for demonstrating the impact of management interventions to resource users.
- Community participation in resource management reduces destructive practices due to peer pressure. However, there is still a need for the participation of the ‘strong arm’ in participatory law enforcement.

A series of lessons learned from the *evaluation process* are also highlighted, such as:

- Evaluating each of 240+ indicators in the M&E Plan against the five evaluation criteria and four key questions was a massive task and created the risk of failing to see the wood for the trees. Consideration should be given to reviewing the appropriateness of giving equal weight to all evaluation criteria in complex projects. It is also suggested that priority be given to evaluating project impact.
- While meetings were of substantial value, their large number limited time available for objective verification using written documents and site visits.
- The itinerary concentrated on meetings rather than on field visits. This may reflect the strong ‘Participatory’ approach of the Programme. However, whilst meetings and document reviews are probably better for evaluating processes, field trips are often better for evaluating outcomes.

Language of the evaluation: English

Available from: IUCN Global Monitoring and Evaluation Initiative, Gland, Switzerland; IUCN/EARO